

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XV.—No. 59.

JULY, 1939.

WHY A FIRST FOLIO SHAKESPEARE REMAINED IN ENGLAND¹

BY ROBERT M. SMITH

WHEN Sir Thomas Bodley founded the Bodleian at Oxford University in 1611, he made an agreement with the London Stationers that they should present to the Library one copy of every book entered at Stationers' Hall. Accordingly, on February 17, 1623-4, a copy of the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays, having arrived in sheets from the press of William and Isaac Jaggard, was delivered to William Wildgoose, the University binder. The Bodleian Binder's Book of 1624 notes that William Wildgoose duly returned the Folio in the Oxford binding which, though tattered and worn, it still bears. The volume was subsequently entered in the 1635 printed appendix to the library catalogue as S. 2. 17 Art. Soon after 1664, when the Third Folio containing seven additional plays was delivered, the Oxford authorities sold their First Folio, as a double or superseded edition, to Richard Davis, the Oxford bookseller, for £24.² Not until the Malone copy arrived with the Malone collection in 1821 did Oxford again come into the possession of a First Folio Shakespeare.

The importance attached to the Bodleian copy of the First Folio over all of those now extant lies in the fact that it is the only one that

¹ I am indebted to Director J. Q. Adams and the staff of the Folger Library for gathering and making accessible source materials for this essay.

² As to this £24, see editor's note on p. 264.

escaped private ownership for forty years after publication, and, so far as we can discover, the only one that went directly from press to institutional library. Moreover, it is one of the few certainly in original binding. Bound at Oxford and catalogued and chained in place on the shelves, it acquired those marks of usage during the years 1623 to 1664 which prove its constant popularity with Oxford students. Judging from the comparative wear and tear of each leaf, *Romeo and Juliet* was most eagerly read—especially the page which faces the well-known balcony scene (III. v.), the most worn of the whole volume, the fabric of the paper being actually worn away without tear, and showing the persistent attrition of readers' hands and elbows. Following *Romeo and Juliet* in popularity come *Julius Caesar*, *The Tempest*, *Henry IV, Part I* (Falstaff), *Macbeth*, and *Cymbeline*, this wear undoubtedly taking place in the Bodleian, and not in the country house where the famous book subsequently found refuge and remained undisturbed for many years.

Not until 1905 was the discarded Folio discovered by Mr. W. G. Turbutt of Ogston Hall, Derbyshire, when looking through the library of his family, who apparently had owned it for a century and a half. His son, Mr. G. M. R. Turbutt, then a resident of Magdalen College, brought the volume to Oxford for examination. Mr. Strickland Gibson, the authority on Oxford bindings, proved in ten minutes by details of the binding, marks of the iron chain staple, and other indications that the original Bodleian copy had been brought back to its ancient home. At a meeting of the Bibliographical Society on February 20, 1905, Mr. Madan exhibited the volume and publicly announced Mr. Gibson's astonishing discovery.

Such preliminary facts of this story soon became widespread when the account of this meeting was duly reported four days later in *The Athenæum*. Less well known, however, is the intense struggle of the Bodleian and the English people to repossess their unique Shakespeare Folio and preserve it from the inordinate passion for First Folios of the great American collector, Henry C. Folger, who had then entered upon his irresistible career of sweeping priceless Shakespeare items from all over the world into his Brooklyn warehouses. Unknown to anyone outside the principals of the transaction, he had already stored away in 1903 the even more famous Vincent-Jaggard First Folio, the only one bearing a presentation inscription, which he proudly called "the most precious book in the English language." For this Folio after an exasperating struggle of

three years he had secretly paid a semi-reluctant English gentleman the unheard of sum of £10,000, the largest price on record at that date for a printed book (see *The Colophon*, Winter Number, 1938).

When William Howard Taft and Mr. Folger walked together in the academic procession, in June 1914, to receive Honorary Degrees from Amherst College, Mr. Folger's alma mater, he told the ex-President with great glee that his copies of the First Folio now numbered forty-four. "Forty-four!" exclaimed Taft. "Then I must call you 'Forty-Four Folio Folger.'"

When Mr. Folger died in 1930 the number had mounted to seventy-nine, including fragments and imperfect copies. Of these at least thirty-three, or possibly thirty-four of them, had escaped the records of that indefatigable census taker of First Folios, Sir Sidney Lee.

When Mr. Folger saw in *The Athenæum* notice of the Bodleian First Folio, he instructed his London agents to interview Mr. Falconer Madan, in whose custody Mr. Turbutt had placed the volume pending negotiations on the part of the University to retrieve it.

In October Mr. Folger's London agents wrote that they had visited the Bodleian and learned that the library did not yet own the book, nor did they seem to be quite so "keen after it" as might have been suspected, but that as the Folio was still there, they felt free to approach Mr. Turbutt himself and had written for permission to call on him. They added that the only hope lay in offering a really high price, "of course as low as possible," and asked for authority to do so. Mr. Folger accordingly cabled them to offer Mr. Turbutt up to £3,000 cash. When the agents presented their offer to Mr. Turbutt at Ogston Hall he replied that he was not thinking of selling the book. Several days later, however, he made a return call on the agents in London and said that though he had already given the Bodleian the first option of purchase, in view of the unusual offer he felt justified in reconsidering his original decision, but was obliged to postpone definite reply for one month. The agents accordingly cabled Folger on October 23, 1905, that they had granted the owner a month to consider, on assurance that no other offer than the Bodleian's would be entertained. They added for Mr. Folger's comfort that in their opinion the offer was a very good one, and all but impossible for the Bodleian to meet.

On November 15, 1905, the agents sent Folger a clipping from

the [*London*] *Standard* announcing that the Bodleian was trying to raise the money for the Turbutt Shakespeare, but they added a doubt whether British enterprise could produce the money. When the month granted was about to expire the agents wrote Mr. Turbutt reminding him of his engagement, but received the reply that he felt he should give the Bodleian a little longer to try to find the money. "I wish the Bodleian to become the possessor, or failing them, your client." The agents then reported to Folger :

We have stamped this letter at Somerset House, and have answered that after to-morrow he must understand that we must consult you again before buying it, and that we hope to have heard of his acceptance before we get your reply.

Folger on November 23 cabled :

Offer for folio made for immediate acceptance cannot extend time cancel if not accepted ;

then fearing lest he might lose his opportunity, he reconsidered and cabled again later on the same day :

Do not cancel offer if you think unwise.

The agents replied on the 25th that they had had no answer from Mr. Turbutt ; they believed, however, that the first cable had done no harm but certainly good, and that if the Bodleian could not find the money within the next few days they expected to get the book.

On December 1, however, the agents were obliged to report that Turbutt had granted the library four months more to find the money, this is regrettable and is doubtless owing to Mr. Turbutt's son being at present an undergraduate at Magdalen and mixing in literary circles in the University. We doubt if a higher offer at this stage would be advisable.

On January 6, 1906, the agents reported that the Bodleian had not yet found the money, probably because "the costs of the General Election then ensuing are telling heavily on the Country interest." On February 19 the *Lancashire Post* carried a notice that the Folio would cross the Atlantic if £3,000 could not be secured by subscription before the end of March, and the librarian, Mr. E. W. B. Nicholson, issued the following appeal in the [*London*] *Times* to Oxford graduates and old Oxford men :

Unless it can be recovered there will be an indelible blot on our scutcheon. At present about £1,300 has been received or promised in

hundreds of subscriptions ranging from the £100 of Lord Rosebery and Mr. S. G. Stopford Sackville to the poor man's florin; not from the British Isles only but even from the Transvaal and Khartum. Cambridge men have asked leave to contribute and so have men and women of no University, and I need not say how gratefully their gifts have been received. Nor should I fail to mention that, through our good friend Dr. Osler, Mr. Henry Phipps of New York has sent £25. The appeal now being privately made will doubtless bring in a few more hundred pounds, but I do not think they can raise the total to £2,000. That after two and a half centuries we should have the extraordinary chance of recovering this volume, and should lose it because a single American can spare more money than all Oxford's sons or friends who have been helping us, is a bitter prospect. It is the more bitter because the abnormal value put on this copy by our competitor rests on knowledge ultimately derived from our own staff and our own registers. But from so cruel a jibe of fortune this appeal may perhaps yet save us.

Mr. Edward Gosse also wrote in the [*London*] *Times* on March 6 :

Who is this millionaire ? Why does he offer a sum three times larger than has hitherto been the market value of the book ? Is he a private person ? Is he a tradesman ? Is he a syndicate ? Does he offer his prodigious sum that he may add a treasure to his personal collection, or that he may sell again at a profit ? Is it unreasonable to ask these questions ? Is it not, rather, exceedingly dangerous that sentimental appeal to public generosity should be made under conditions which do not admit of a clear appreciation of the state of affairs ?

Similarly appeared an editorial appeal in the *Western Daily Press* for March 13, 1906 :

On every ground of national sentiment and literary expediency the volume that is now on the market should not be allowed to quit this country.

In America the *New York Times Book Review*, echoing British opinion, referred to a "reprehensible American millionaire" who had offered \$15,000 for the book.

On March 16, 1906, the agents wrote Folger that if anything could appeal, this publicity "would get the money in, but up to to-day it had apparently not succeeded." In a few days they promised to drive Mr. Turbutt to bay by telling him that the offer was contingent on receiving his acceptance not later than the morning of April 2,—the 31st being on Saturday.

On March 24, when the pledges paid or promised totalled only

£1,967, Mr. Nicholson published another fervent appeal in the [London] *Times* :

No number of small donations which can now be received can by themselves save the book, though they will be most valuable to help to save it. But among those to whom my former letter appealed and that larger circle with whom the *Times* itself so warmly pleaded on our behalf, are many men who can give hundreds without missing them. When this book is on the way to America, which I apprehend will be on April 2, some of these will agree with your paper that "a grave scandal" has befallen, and will regret that a mistaken confidence in other people's promptitude hindered them from averting it.

Five days later the *Morning Post* announced :

The fund to restore to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, its First Folio of Shakespeare has reached £2,594. A London resident (not an Oxford man) has guaranteed £300 for himself and relatives. Just over £400 must now be guaranteed by the librarian by Saturday to save the volume for Oxford and this country.

Two days later, at his agent's request, Mr. Folger cabled £3,000 in preparation for the transfer, but too late, for in the [London] *Times* for Friday, March 30, 1906 (p. 10), appeared a letter of thanks by Mr. Nicholson under the caption :

SHAKESPEARE AND THE BODLEIAN

Sir,

The Shakespeare is saved. The great generosity of Mr. Alfred A. de Pass and his relatives has done much to this end, and now (through Professor Osler) Lord Strathcona sends £500, which more than completes £3,000 and enables me to give the owner the necessary guarantee at once.

Nearly £1,000 of the total is in promises, some of them running in terms which render payment a matter of uncertainty. If any other subscriptions are received they will be treated as part of the fund, and after the Bank's draft for £3,000 has been paid to the owner of the volume, any surplus will be returned to subscribers in accordance with the equities.

Our obligations to *The Times* for its powerful aid have been very great. Permit me to add that of the sum raised we owe nearly a fifth to the enthusiastic efforts of Dr. Osler and that Lord Strathcona, who has crowned those efforts with success is, I am happy to say, an adopted son of this University, having been created an hon. D.C.L. at the Bodleian Tercentenary.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

E. W. B. NICHOLSON, Bodley's Librarian.

Bodleian Library, Oxford.

To Sir William Osler Mr. Nicholson wrote privately :

My dear Osler, You deserve a statue in the Bodleian Quadrangle.
(Cushing, *Life of Osler*, II, 45 ff.)

On April 2, 1906, the agents accordingly broke to Mr. Folger the disheartening news.

Regret owner sold to Bodleian their subscription completed at last moment.

Mr. Folger cabled instantly :

Offer Turbutt 5,000 if transfer is not finally closed.

Next day came the reply :

Transfer final.

and in a letter dated April 4 they explained :

Mr. Turbutt himself subscribed £200 to the fund, so he was a loser to that amount by selling to the Bodleian instead of to us ; but as an old Oxford man with his son at present at Magdalen College, it was only the largeness of your offer which tempted him at all. With Lord Strathcona in reserve the Bodleian was bound to win.

We feel as we have said, that the present matter leaves your own immeasurably finer and more interesting copy [*i.e.* the Vincent-Jaggard copy] absolutely unique in the world.

But Mr. Folger with the persistence of a Standard Oil pioneer was not yet ready to acknowledge that the prize had wholly slipped from his grasp. On April 9, he cabled :

See librarian and offer £1,500 cash for privilege having book in my collection during my life they to be completely protected thus relieving subscribers making sacrifices. If I had purchased would have willed book to Bodleian. Wrote you fully Saturday. If necessary book may remain permanently stored in London.

Folger

Three days later the agents replied :

Have seen librarian who says price was over subscribed at the last and they meant to have it at any cost transfer has been completed both your cables and letter received but nothing further possible.

In explanation they added by letter :

As regards the Turbutt Folio, you will to-day have had our final cable explaining how further negotiations are unhappily useless. Instantly on

getting your cable to offer £1,500 cash for you to have the book in your collection during life, we went to Oxford and were fortunate in calling on Mr. E. B. W. Nicholson, Bodley's Librarian, at the Library before he left for Easter. We put your proposition in its most favorable view before him. I, taking advantage of your having left your name out of the newspapers, showed him your cable. He received it very well but said that the purchase was finally completed (showing us the book upon the shelves), and that after completion a large number of further subscriptions had come in. He said that the Bodleian had determined to have the book six months before our offer, and that had other subscriptions failed he had resolved to guarantee *any* necessary amount himself out of his private pocket. He was so determined that you can have the satisfaction of feeling that even a larger initial offer would not have gained the volume. Guided by his attitude we have, therefore, refrained from proposing your final suggestion of leaving the volume stored in England. You can at least feel that everything possible has been done, but the fact that the matter has been made a national one would have stood in the way of even a larger offer.

This memorable pursuit to capture the second illustrious copy of Shakespeare's First Folio came to a bitter conclusion for Mr. Folger when he read the concluding passage of a letter dated April 18, 1906.

It is a very sincere regret to me that after all our trouble I fear I must say there is no hope but I fear it is so. I have to-day your esteemed letter of the 5th giving in full the idea in your cable that the Bodleian might, in consideration of your generously offered donation of £1,500, allow you to have the loan of the volume during your life; but I am compelled to say that it would be of absolutely no use to make it, and would possibly do harm. At our interview with Mr. Nicholson (Bodley's Librarian) he would not even take the volume out of the book case, only showing its back (such as it is!) and saying that now they had got it they meant to take the greatest possible care of it, so that we can only resign ourselves to the inevitable. As I said in my previous letter, I fear we never really had any chance, even at the highest possible price, owing to its being considered a national matter.

As requested in your cable of the 16th instant I now have pleasure in sending you the first of a sight draft for \$13,573, or £2,800.

Believe me always your faithful servant.

[NOTE to p. 257. The price stated to have been paid by the bookseller Davis for the Turbutt Folio in 1664 must surely be a mistake. According to *The Original Bodleian Copy of the First Folio* (1905), p. 5, it appears in the Bodleian accounts for Sept. 1663—Sept. 1664 that the sum of £24 was received from Davis for 'superfluous Library Books sold by order of the Curators'—which is of course quite a different thing! There is, however, no time to refer the proof of this article back to the author in America for correction of what is probably a mere accidental omission of the words 'with other books.' Ed. R.E.S.]

ASTROPHEL AND STELLA AND THE ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE

By J. H. WALTER

CRITICS of poetry are not infrequently guilty of ignoring the pronouncements of poets on their own art. While Sidney's *Apologie for Poetrie* is held to be an important document in the history of Elizabethan literary criticism, the principles and opinions expressed in it have rarely been applied to Sidney's own poetry. It was while applying the well-known canon of imitation of the best authors laid down in the *Apologie* that the present writer was led to an interesting investigation, the results of which follow in the course of this article.

That Sidney may have been following this doctrine has not, of course, been overlooked. Sir Sidney Lee¹ and Miss Janet Scott² have traced the sources of individual sonnets of *Astrophel and Stella* with great zeal, but it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that there might be a model for the whole story of the sonnet sequence. Of the models available to Sidney, the chivalric *Roman de la Rose* was the one most congenial to his temperament. Moreover, it would have been difficult for Sidney not to be acquainted with the insistent *Roman de la Rose* tradition, for Chaucer's love poems are its recognizable descendants,³ and the sixteenth-century editions of Chaucer's works contained other works in that same tradition,⁴ as well as a translation of part of the *Rose* itself, *The Romaunt of the Rose*. Likewise, Petrarch,⁵ Du Bellay,⁶ and Marot,⁷ with whose works Sidney was acquainted, either imitated the *Roman de la Rose* or gave it high praise.⁸ That Sidney did model

¹ *Elizabethan Sonnets*.

² *Les Sonnets élisabéthains*, Paris, 1929.

³ Cf. Lewis, *Allegory of Love*, p. 166.

⁴ Usk's *Testament of Love*, Henryson's *Testament of Criseyde*, and the anonymous *Court of Love and Remedy of Love* (Stowe's 1561 edition).

⁵ Petrarch is indebted to the *Roman* in his *Trionfi*.

⁶ *Défense et Illustration de la Langue Française*, II. 2 (ed. Ségur), p. 114.

⁷ Marot imitated it in *La Queste de Ferme-Amour*, 1514, and is held to be the editor of the 1530 edition of the *Roman*.

⁸ The Tuscan poet Durante had, in the thirteenth century, rendered *The Roman* in sonnets. His work, *Il Fiore*, consists of two hundred and thirty-two sonnets of which the first thirty-three sum up Guillaume de Lorris' part. Sidney does not appear to have known of *Il Fiore*. (*Il Fiore*. Publications Spéciales de la Société pour l'Etude des Langues Romanes. Montpellier, 1881.)

Astrophel and Stella on the *Roman de la Rose*, or rather on its English version, *The Romaunt of the Rose*, it is hoped will become apparent from what follows.

It is perhaps as well to state at the outset that Sidney does not follow out the allegorical method of *The Romaunt*, although he does use personifications, particularly near the beginning of the sequence. Therefore, the words and actions attributed to Danger, Bialacoil, Pity, Franchise, and other personifications of the personal qualities of the Rose will, in *Astrophel and Stella*, be attributed to Stella herself. Likewise, Reason's arguments may be attributed either to friends or to Stella. Wicked-Tongue and Jealousy are obviously external forces, and will, therefore, be associated with observers or, in the latter case, with the lady's husband, as was customary in mediæval love poetry.

Neither *Astrophel* nor the Dreamer of *The Romaunt* falls in love at first sight. To *Astrophel*

Not at first sight, nor with a dribbing shot,
Love gave the wound, which while I breath will bleede : . . .
I sawe and lik'd, I lik'd but loved not, (II.)¹

While the Dreamer, after being admitted by the Portress, Idleness, into the garden of Mirth and his crew, spends some time in love dalliance (1,346-1,450)² and in the "*ROSER* charged ful of roses" (1,651) before he chooses one of the rose-buds.

Cupid makes Stella his dwelling-place and radiates the power of love through her eyes (VII, IX-XII, XVII), even as the Dreamer, looking in the Fountain of Narcissus, sees two "cristal stones" (1,568) or the "mirour perilous" (1,601) of his lady's eyes, wherein

daun Cupido,
Hath sowen there of love the seed. (1,616-7.)

Astrophel, after rejecting the appeals of Reason (XVIII), is ambushed by Love (XX), whom Nature has armed with bows and arrows of Stella's brows and eyes (XVII):

¹ The references are to *The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney* (ed. Feuillerat), vol. II. Readings from the 1598 edition, recorded by Feuillerat, pp. 372 ff., have occasionally been adopted.

² The references are to *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (ed. Skeat), I. 93-259.

Flye, flye my friendes, I have my deathes wound, flye ;
 See there that boy, that murdering boy I say,
 Who like a thiefe hid in a bush doth lye,
 Tyll bloody bullet get him wrongfull pray.
 So, tyrant he no fitter place could spy,
 Nor so farre leuell in so secrete stay :
 As that sweete blacke which veiles thy heavenly eye,
 There he himselfe with his shot close doth laye.
 Poore passenger, passe now thereby I did,
 And stayed pleasd with the prospect of the place,
 While that black hue from me the bad guest hid,
 But straight I saw motions of lightnings grace,
 And there discried the glisterings of his dart :
 But ere I could flie thence, it pearst my hart. (XX.)

The Dreamer, likewise, is ambushed beside the Fountain of Narcissus (1,450 *et seq.*). He gazes in the "mirour perilous" and among the roses sees one fairer than the rest (1,691-4), and seeks to obtain it (1,708-9). At this moment the God of Love from his ambush by a fig-tree

... shet at me so wonder smerte,
 That through myn eye unto myn herte
 The takel smoot, and depe it wente. (1,727-9.)

The Dreamer, after some reluctance, yields and becomes Love's man (1,944-81). He is told the decrees he must obey (2,130-2,386). Astrophel similarly describes how

At length to Loves decrees, I first agreede.
 Yet with repining at so partiall lot. (II.)

But the God of Love warns the Dreamer that having given his heart he will undergo grievous troubles (2,389-90). He will desire a melancholy solitude :

... hyde thyn harm thou must alone,
 And go forth sole, and make thy mone. (2,395-6.)

He will be tongue-tied :

... many tymes thou shalt be
 Stille as an image of tree,
 Dom as a stoon, without stering
 Of foot or hond, without speking. (2,407-10.)

and long for a glimpse of the loved one. Even so Astrophel, smitten by love, confesses that "dull pensiveness" betrays

... it selfe in my long settled eyes:
 When these same fumes and mellancholie rise, (XXIII.)

and he becomes abstracted and tongue-tied :

. . . I oft in darke abstracted guise,
Seeme most alone in greatest company,
With dearth of words, and aunswers quite awry. (XXVII.)

The Dreamer is warned by Love that he shall sleepless

. . . walowe in wo the longe night,
Thyne armis shalt thou sprede abrede,
As man in werre were forwerreyd.
Than shal thee come a remembraunce
Of hir shape and hir semblaunce,
Wherto non other may be pere.
And wite thou wel, withoute were,
That thee shal [seme], somtyme that night,
That thou hast hir, that is so bright,
Naked bitwene thyn armes there,
Al sothfastnesse as though it were.
Thou shalt make castels than in Spayne,
And dreme of Ioye, al but in vayne,
And thee delyten of right nought,
Why! thou so slomrest in that thought,
That is so swete and delitable,
The which, in soth, nis but a fable,
For it ne shal no whyle laste.
Than shalt thou sighe and wepe faste,
And say, "Dere god, what thing is this?
My dreme is turned al amis,
Which was ful swete and apparent,
But now I wake, it is al shent!" (2,562-84.)

In the same way Astrophel is sleepless (XL), and woos sleep (XXXIX) and dreams of Stella (XXXII), and again in XXXVIII :

This night while sleepe begins, with heave wings
To close mine eyes, and that my troubled thought
Doth fall to stray, and my chiefe powers are brought
To leave the scepter of all subject things,
The first that straight my fancies errour brings
Unto my minde, is *Stellas* image, wrought
By Loves owne selfe, but with so curious draught,
That she mee thinks not onely shines but sings :
I start, looke hart, harke, but what inclos'd up sence
Was helde, in open view it flies away,
Leaving me nought but wayling eloquence.
I seeing bitter sights in sights decay,
Cald it anew, and woeed Sleepe againe,
But him her hoast her unkind guest had slaine.

The God of Love thereafter leaves the Dreamer (2,954), and does not appear again in *The Romaunt* until 5,811. From this point in the story of Astrophel Love appears much less frequently, and no longer as the all-conquering power of the first twenty sonnets.

Astrophel laments a neglected opportunity (XXXIII) and is

accordingly in despair (XXXIV, XXXV). The Dreamer is given his opportunity of approaching the Rose by Bialacoil (3,067-3,129), and, demanding too much, is expelled by Danger (3,130-62) and left disconsolate. Reason at this point vainly attempts to dissuade him from the service of Love (3,193-3,334).

Astrophel, in despair, pleads for pity and grace (XLIV, XLVIII), for he knows that Stella is capable of feeling pity (XLV, LX). Likewise, the Dreamer, "Forwery, forwardred as a fool," seeks and obtains encouragement from a friend. Pity and Franchise take his side against Danger, and persuade him to admit the Dreamer to the Rose again (3,499-3,626). Stella attempts to reason Astrophel out of his love for her (LXI, LXII, LXIV, LXVIII). Then suddenly he sees signs of hope (LXVI, LXVII), even as the Dreamer, by the good offices of Bialacoil, is admitted once more to the Rose (3,621-26).

Stella yields Astrophel her heart upon strict platonic conditions (LXIX, LXXI, LXXII). He, however, yielding to desire, steals a kiss from her (Sonnet 2,¹ LXXIII) to her annoyance. In a subsequent sonnet (LXXXII) he apologizes to her whom he addresses in significant words as

Nymph of the garden where all beauties be,
Beauties which doe in excellence surpasse,
His who till death lookt in a watry glasse.

The Dreamer, admitted to the garden, pleads with Bialacoil, who, by the power of Venus who comes to the Dreamer's aid, allows him to kiss the Rose (3,649-3,770).

Thereupon Wicked-Tongue arouses Jealousy (3,799-3,860). In the same way jealousy arises after Astrophel has kissed Stella :

Oh, how the pleasant ayres, of true Love bee
Infected by those vapours, which arise
From out that noysome gulfe : which gaping lies
Betweene the jawes of hellish Jelousey. (LXXXVIII.)

And in LXXXIII is a punning allusion to the same thing.

He visits Stella, who has been removed from his immediate circle (LXXXIV, LXXXV), but finds she is still cold towards him (Sonnet 4, LXXXVI), and he is forced from her (LXXXVII), although he sees that she grieves (LXXXVII). The Rose is removed

¹ The songs so entitled were inserted in the sonnets in the 1598 edition ; previously they had been appended.

by Jealousy to a fortress, and Bialacoil is imprisoned "in woo and drede" in a central tower under the surveillance of an old "vekke" (3,871 *et seq.*, 4,145 *et seq.*). From the nature of her guards—Shame, Dread, and Danger—it is clear that, in the words of Lewis,¹ "Her modesty, her fears, and her 'danger,' co-operate with the gossips of the court and with the jealousy of her relations to shut up and to suspend from all operation that 'fair-welcome' which, none the less, she cannot root out of her heart."

Astrophel bitterly laments his separation from Stella (LXXXVII–LXXXIX, XCI–XCVI, XCVIII–C). At one moment he thinks of forswearing love (LXXXVIII). The Dreamer, too, in the midst of his lamenting thinks of breaking his vows to Love (4,519–4,546).²

Astrophel attempts to see Stella, but only sees her at a distance (CIII) or just misses her (CV). He is left in woe (CVIII). The Dreamer is also left apart from the Rose in sorrow (4,315 *et seq.*).

It is at this point that both *Astrophel and Stella* and Guillaume de Lorris's part of *The Romaunt* come to an end.³

So much for the outline of the story. There are, however, other points of resemblance.

Astrophel and Stella contains two sonnets quibbling on the word "rich" (XXIV, XXXVII), and one in which the following statement occurs :

Honour is honoured, that thou dost possesse
Him as thy slave, and now long needie Fame
Doth even grow rich, meaning my *Stellas* name. (XXXV.)

The XXXVIIth sonnet claims that "towards Auroras court" there dwells a nymph who is rich in all qualities, and who has no misfortune but that "Rich she is." The opening lines of this sonnet have been taken by Miss Wilson to refer to the raging of Sidney's love for the nymph.⁴ On the contrary,

My mouth doth water, and my brest doth swell,
My tongue doth itch, my thoughts in labour be :

surely refers to his desire to give bitter, venomous thoughts their utterance. The third sonnet (XXIV) states that even base, foolish rich men intent on multiplying their gains have the wit to take care of the wealth they love. But that rich fool who owns the "richest gem of love and life" has no more sense than to abuse it. May he lose the highest treasure of life and remain rich only in folly. The first four lines :

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 134.

² In Jean de Meun's continuation.

³ L. 4,432.

⁴ *Sir Philip Sidney*, p. 187 *et passim*.

Rich fooles there be, whose base and filthy hart,
Lyes hatching still the goods wherein they flow :
Damning themselves to *Tantalus* his smart,
Welth breeding want, more rich, more wretched grow.

are similar in thought to 5,595-5,600 :

And set evermore his bisynesse
For to encrease, and not to lesse,
For to augment and multiply.
And though on hepis [it] lye him by,
Yit never shal make his richesse
Asseth unto his gredinesse.

This passage comes in a lengthy attack on avarice and rich men by Reason (5,311-5,810). Later we learn that Richness, one of Mirth's crew (1,033-1,148), prevents the Dreamer from gaining access to the Rose after she has been immured in Jealousy's castle. The God of Love hears the report of his baronage on Richness' attitude (5,817-46) and vows fierce vengeance on any rich man he may gripe (5,975-6,016). His councillors support his oath :

For, sir, this wot we wel biforn ;
If riche men doon you homage,
That is as fooles doon outrage. (6,022-4.)

It is strange at least that the evidence of these "rich" sonnets, which is assumed to be strongly in favour of the Penelope Rich ascription, should have so extensive a counterpart in *The Romaunt*.

In *The Romaunt* Reason appears twice to the Dreamer (3,218-3,332 and 4,620 *et seq.*). Similarly, in *Astrophel and Stella* on two main occasions (X, XIV, XVIII, XXI and LXI, LXII, LXIV) arguments uttered by Reason, friends, or Stella, are put forward against his love. The arguments in general do not seem closely parallel, except 5,116-5,134 and XVIII :

For many oon, as it is seyn,
Have lost, and spent also in veyn,
In his servyse, withoute socour,
Body and soule, good, and tresour,
Wit, and strengthe, and eek richesse,
Of which they hadde never redresse. (5,129-34.)

with,

With what strange checkes I in my selfe am shent,
When into Reasons Audit I doe goe :
And by just counts my selfe a Banckerowt know
Of all those goods which heaven to me hath lent,
Unable quite, to pay even Natures rent,
Which unto it by birth-right I doe owe :
And which is worse, no good excuse can shewe,
But that my wealth I have most idly spent,
My youth doth waste, my knowledge brings forth toyes,
My wit doth strive, those passions to defende
Which for reward, spoyle it with vaine annoyas ;
I see my course, to loose my selfe doth bende. (XVIII.)

Both Astrophel and the Dreamer, however, are at one in their blunt rejection of the arguments of Reason, not on any logical grounds but simply because love is for them sufficient reason.

Sonnet 4, which was inserted after LXXXV in the 1598 edition, is closely paralleled by part of the God of Love's warning to the Dreamer. Astrophel visits Stella under the cloak of night while

Danger hence good care doth keepe,
Jealozie himselfe doth sleepe :

and bids her "Take me to thee, and thee to mee." There is no better place, even the moon does not disclose them except to each other. The whole household is asleep. Take the opportunity while there is time. But Stella thrusts him away, and in despair he vows to kill himself. In *The Romaunt* (2,645-80) the Dreamer is recommended to go by night to his lady's house. He should peep through the door and make sure that the whole household is asleep. If all are asleep except his lady, he should ask grace of her, for women ought to take pity on him who suffers for love and reward him with a kiss. Then, lest any man should see him, he should steal away before daybreak.

Finally, the theme of the VIIth sonnet may have received its inspiration from *The Romaunt*. Compare,

When nature made her chiefe worke, *Stellas* eyes,
In collour blacke, why wrapt she beames so bright ? . . .
Shee even in blacke doth make all Beauties flowe :
But so and thus, she minding Love should bee
 Plaste ever there, gave him this mourning weede :
 To honour all their deatheaes, who for her bleede.

with

For al-so wel wol love be set . . .
And eek as wel be amourettes
In mourning blak, as bright burnettes.
For noon is of so mochel prys. . . .
[But] he with love may daunted be.
Al the world holdith this way ;
Love makith alle to goon miswey. (4,753-66.)

Astrophel and Stella is usually regarded as unfinished, and it has been suggested that Sidney intended to write a palinode of which the two sonnets "Thou blind man's mark" and "Leave me O Love" form a part. This would certainly be in keeping with mediæval tradition, but it is not certain that these two sonnets belong to *Astrophel and Stella*. However, if Sidney was following the story of Guillaume de Lorris, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he broke off his sonnet sequence because his model broke off

at that point. He may, of course, have felt that there was some artistic and moral justification for ending with virtue triumphant and the lover in despair, but such a possibility is purely conjectural.¹

In brief, Sidney was almost certainly acquainted with *The Romaunt*, and as a model it had the advantages of a high chivalric morality. The passages in the older poem which have parallels in *Astrophel and Stella* all occur in the English fragment *The Romaunt*: there is no hint that Sidney used the French version. Finally, if it be admitted that Sidney did use *The Romaunt* as a model, his aims and methods as a poet, the consistency of his practice with his precept, and his final rank as a poet become the more clearly defined.

¹ In this connexion it is interesting to note that in Spenser's *Amoretti* the lover wins his lady's love, but then the sequence ends with the lover bewailing her absence. The *Amoretti*, too, has resemblances to *The Romaunt*.

JONSON AND DONNE

A PROBLEM OF AUTHORSHIP

BY EVELYN SIMPSON

ONE of the most difficult problems in the *Underwoods* of Jonson is presented by the group of Elegies which occupy pages 202-7 of the 1640 Folio (numbered lvii-lx by Gifford, xxxviii-xli by Herford). Gifford ascribes them all to Jonson, but he quotes Whalley's note pointing out that the second of the group had been published among Donne's poems. Whalley mentioned only the 1669 edition of Donne, and asserted of the elegy "How it came there I know not, for there is no doubt but it is Jonson's." Gifford, aware that the poem was found in the 1633 edition, commented: "I have already observed that there was a mutual communication of MSS. between the two poets, and the verses before us might be found among the doctor's papers (for he was now dead), and published by his son, or by those who collected them, as his own."

Gifford does not, however, note that Jonson was alive and was still writing verse in 1633. If one of his poems had been published as Donne's, would he not have made a protest, or at least have marked on his own copy that the lines had been wrongly ascribed to Donne?

On the other hand, Swinburne attributed all four elegies to Donne on the ground of style. "The four very powerful and remarkable elegies on a lover's quarrel and separation I should be inclined to attribute rather to Donne than to Jonson; their earnest passion, their quaint frankness, their verbal violence, their eccentric ardour of expression, at once unabashed and vehement, spontaneous and ingenious, are all of them typical characteristics of the future dean in the secular and irregular days of his hot poetic youth."¹ C. H. Herford decided in favour of Donne's authorship, mainly on the ground of style, but also because he recognized that the appearance of no. xxxix in the 1633 edition of Donne's *Poems* afforded better

¹ *A Study of Ben Jonson*, pp. 106-7. I have quoted only the first sentence; the rest of the paragraph should be studied.

evidence of authorship than did its belated publication "in the loose, ill-edited collection of the *Underwoods*" after Jonson's death.¹

Jonson's latest editor, Mr. B. H. Newdigate, returns to Gifford's position. He argues that "Jonson's muse is sometimes so like Donne's that on merely literary grounds it would be rash to ascribe any of these four Elegies to one rather than to the other. Their presence in 'Under-wood' is a strong reason for accepting them as Jonson's."² On another page he observes: "In *The Expostulation* there are echoes of Catullus such as abound in Jonson but are rare in Donne."³

The editors of Donne, however, are unanimous in claiming no. xxxix (printed as Elegie xv, *The Expostulation*, by Grierson) as a genuine work of that poet. Sir E. K. Chambers, in his edition of Donne's poems, put the case succinctly:

This poem was included in the collection of verses called *Underwoods*, which first appeared in the second folio edition (1641) of Ben Jonson's works. . . . I see no reason, however, to take it from Donne. It appeared in two editions, 1633 and 1635, during Jonson's life; the *Underwoods* is posthumous, and of no great authority; and both style and sentiment are characteristic of Donne. Many points in the Elegy, for instance, may be paralleled from Elegy xi. l. 91 *sqq.*; from *Woman's Constancy*, and from *The Curse*. It is signed J. D. in William Drummond's Hawthornden MS. 15.⁴

Similarly Sir Herbert Grierson has expressed no doubt of the genuineness of *The Expostulation*, but has included it in the canon of Donne's undoubted poems in his authoritative edition, although he has rejected a large number of other poems which had been fathered on Donne by previous editors. He has shown that the 1633 edition of the *Poems*, in which *The Expostulation* first appeared, was trustworthy both as regards text and canon. Moreover, in his critical apparatus he has enumerated twelve seventeenth-century manuscripts of Donne's poems in which this elegy appears, and certain of them are of great authority. I may mention the Hawthornden MS., to which Chambers has referred, and also the Norton MS., Harvard College Library.

In addition to the manuscripts enumerated by Grierson, there is an important manuscript which was acquired in 1932 by Harvard

¹ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, II. 383-4. Dr. Percy Simpson points out that Sidney Godolphin's "Faire Friend, 'tis true your beauties move" was printed as Jonson's in the Folio (xl. in Gifford's numbering).

² *Poems of Ben Jonson*, p. 358.

³ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

⁴ *Poems of John Donne*, I. 241.

College Library from Mr. P. J. Dobell.¹ This is probably the most comprehensive manuscript extant of Donne's work, for it contains a very large number of his poems, and also three sermons, a few letters, and paradoxes and problems. I am inclined to think that it was written for the Countess of Montgomery, who was one of Donne's patronesses, since it contains a letter to her prefixed to the sermon on Matthew xxi. 44 (printed in *Six Sermons* of 1634, and in *Fifty Sermons* of 1649, without the letter). Here *The Expostulation* is found among a number of other elegies by Donne, and the variant readings which it contains, though not of any particular interest in themselves, show that it was not copied from any printed text of the poem.

An attempt to prove that *The Expostulation* was written by Jonson and not by Donne has recently been made by Malcolm L. Wilder² in the *Modern Language Review* (xxi. 431-5). He declares that "Jonson's editors have not deigned to argue the question of authorship." He is aware that Chambers and Grierson have decided in favour of Donne, but he does not consider their evidence convincing. "And while Sir Edmund Chambers, in editing Donne, has at least realized the necessity of stating why he believes in Donne's authorship, he has not, it seems to me, proved his case." Wilder then argues that the fact that the poem is ascribed to "J.D." (John Donne) in the Hawthornden MS. is not sufficient proof. He seems to be totally unaware that the testimony of this manuscript, important as it is, does not stand alone, but is supported by a large body of other manuscripts. Any poem which appears as Donne's in these manuscripts would have a strong claim to be attributed to him even if it had not been printed in the edition of 1633, but the combination of manuscript evidence with that of the editions of 1633, 1635, and 1639 is so powerful as to be quite decisive in favour of Donne's authorship.³

¹ Harvard, Nor. 4506. That portion which contains the paradoxes and problems was described in my article in the *Review of English Studies*, Vol. x, pp. 289-300.

² He tries to prove Jonson's authorship by two metrical tests, which, as he himself admits, are not convincing. His argument is, however, mainly based on the number of classical borrowings in the poem. He adduces parallels from Ovid, Catullus, and Seneca, and makes the strange statement that "Seneca was not, apparently, much used by Donne." As Ovid and Seneca are two of Donne's favourite Latin authors, the argument has little force.

³ It should be noted that the only two poems in 1633 which are not accepted by modern editors as Donne's are Basse's *Epitaph on Shakespeare*, which was immediately recognized as spurious, and was not reprinted in 1635 or any later edition, and a metrical version of Psalm 137, which is ascribed to Donne in one MS., and to Francis Davison in three MSS.

There is, however, no external evidence for giving the remaining elegies, xxxviii, xl, xli, to Donne. They were not printed in Donne's *Poems*, and they are not ascribed to Donne in the manuscripts. If we are to take them from Jonson, it must be on the ground of style alone, and because they are regarded as linked indissolubly with *The Expostulation*. Gifford asserted this connection with his usual positiveness. "This and the next three Elegies are all addressed to the same person." Swinburne thought that they were all occasioned by a lovers' quarrel and separation. Castelain gave a much fuller examination of the evidence, and summed up in favour of Donne's authorship of all four elegies. "Pour moi, celui qui a écrit l'une est forcément l'auteur des autres ; or ces dernières sont encore plus différentes des poésies authentiques de Jonson."¹ He attacked Chambers for giving *The Expostulation* to Donne, while leaving the three other elegies to Jonson : "E. K. Chambers, tout en conservant celle-ci, se refuse, sur une simple impression littéraire, à insérer les trois autres dans les Œuvres de Donne."²

The arguments adduced by Castelain are not convincing. He states erroneously that *The Expostulation* did not appear till the 1635 edition of Donne, and adds "Si les trois autres ont été découvertes après l'apparition du second folio (1641), on a pu concevoir des doutes sur leur authenticité et renoncer à les donner."³ This style of argument neglects entirely the important evidence of the manuscripts. To anyone who has studied the large body of manuscripts written before the publication of Donne's poems, it is incredible that the three elegies should not appear in certain of them together with *The Expostulation*, if the four poems formed the "inseparable whole" which M. Castelain sees in them.⁴

But is it indeed true that there is any indissoluble link between the four poems? *The Expostulation* makes its own position clear, and does not need the help of the other three poems. In fact, the quarrel described in xxxviii cannot well be the same as that which forms the subject of *The Expostulation*.

Of xxxviii Gifford writes "The Lady, whoever she was, appears to have had a love affair with the poet, who, in a moment of intoxi-

¹ *La Vie et l'Œuvre de Ben Jonson*, p. 803 n.

² *Ibid.*, p. 802 n.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 803 n.

⁴ "Or, comme ces quatre élégies paraissent former un tout inséparable et présentent les mêmes caractères pour le style et la composition, il y a tout lieu de penser qu'elles appartiennent à Donne et à lui seul." *Ibid.*, p. 802.

cation, had betrayed her confidence, and disclosed the secret of their connection." The tone of the poem is one of humble apology.

I will not stand to justifie my fault,
Or lay the excuse upon the Vintners vault ;
Or in confessing of the Crime be nice,
Or goe about to countenance the vice,
By naming in what companie 'twas in,
As I would urge Authoritie for sinne.
No, I will stand arraign'd, and cast, to be
The Subject of your Grace in pardoning me,
And (Stil'd your mercies Creature) will live more
Your honour now, then your disgrace before.
Thinke it was frailtie, Mistris, thinke me man,
Thinke that your selfe like heaven forgive me can,
Where weaknesse doth offend, and vertue grieve,
There greatnesse takes a glorie to relieve.
Thinke that I once was yours, or may be now,
Nothing is vile, that is a part of you :
Errour and folly in me may have crost
Your just commands ; yet those, not I be lost.¹

I cannot recall any poem in which Donne thus humiliates himself before his lady. In the first place, drunkenness was not an offence with which he was wont to be charged, though Ben had at times found himself in difficulties through this fault.² Secondly, Donne's tone in his elegies is generally that of arrogant contempt or crude physical passion. In *The Expostulation* he strikes his usual note at once :

To make the doubt cleare, that no woman's true,
Was it my fate to prove it strong in you ?
Thought I, but one had breathed purest aire,
And must she needs be false because she's faire ?
Is it your beauties marke, or of your youth,
Or your perfection, not to study truth ?
Or thinke you heaven is deafe, or hath no eyes ?
Or those it hath, smile at your perjuries ?³

Those who assume with Gifford that the four elegies were written on the same occasion need to justify this extraordinary change of tone. In xxxviii the poet is the offender, and begs his mistress for mercy in the most abject way. But in xxxix (*The Expostulation*) he first reviles the lady for her falsehood, the natural prerogative, according to him, of her sex. When in the latter part of the poem he relents, he still takes no blame to himself, but casts it partly on a third person and partly on the lady's weakness.

¹ *Underwoods* (1640 Folio, pp. 202-3).

² *Conversations with Drummond*, ll. 646-8.

³ Grierson, *Poems of Donne*, I. 108. The text throughout is much better than that given in the *Underwoods*.

But O that treacherous breast to whom weake you
 Did trust our Counsell, and wee both may rue,
 Having his falshood found too late, 'twas hee
 That made me cast you guilty, and you me,
 Whilst he, black wretch, betray'd each simple word
 Wee spake, unto the cunning of a third.
 Curst may hee be, that so our love hath slaine,
 And wander on the earth, wretched as Cain . . .

After a long bout of vigorous cursing, he begins love-making :

Now have I curst, let us our love revive ;
 In mee the flame was never more alive . . .

This lively and dramatic representation of the alternations of a lover's mood is quite in the manner of Donne, and is in vivid contrast with the static mood and rather monotonous entreaties of xxxviii.

Throughout the three elegies for which the external evidence is in favour of Jonson's authorship, there runs a thread of the mediæval convention by which the lady is "mistress" and the lover her "servant." Thus the poet addresses his lady as "Offended Mistris" (xxxviii, l. 9), "Mistris" (*ibid.*, l. 31). He implores her, "Then Mistris¹ here, here let your rigour end" (*ibid.*, l. 105), and again "Heare Mistris, your departing servant tell" (xli, l. 2). "Mistris" is used again in xl, ll. 9 and 25; and in l. 41 the poet calls himself her "servant"—"And such your servant is"—as also in xli, l. 2. Finally "sweet Mistris" occurs in xli, l. 14.

On the other hand, in *The Expostulation* we have no use of the terms "mistress" and "servant," and this is in harmony with the rest of Donne's love-poetry. Donne was a deliberate rebel against the Petrarchan convention. Throughout his *Elegies* and *Songs and Sonets* he addresses the lady in such terms as these: "Fond woman" (*Elegy* i, l. 1), "Natures lay Ideot" (*Elegy* vii, l. 1), "murdresse" (*The Apparition*, l. 1), "Foole" (*Elegy* vii, l. 3). When he is in a tenderer mood, the lady becomes "dearest Friend" (*Elegy* xii, l. 83), "my Dear" (*ibid.*, l. 95), "faire Love" (*Elegy* xvi, l. 13), "Deare" (*Lovers infinitenesse*, ll. 2, 11, 22), "Sweetest love" (*Song*, l. 1), "Deare love" (*The Dreame*, l. 1). When he uses the term "mistress" it is as a common noun in almost every case, and not as a term of address. Thus we find :

Love's not so pure, and abstract, as they use
 To say, which have no Mistresse but their Muse
 (*Loves growth*, ll. 11-12)

¹ Here, and in xl. 25, xli. 2, the Folio absurdly prints "Masters" for "Mistris." Jonson evidently used the contraction "Mrs." in these lines, as in xl. 9.

or again

And now as other Fawknars use
I spring a mistresse, sweare, write, sigh and weepe
(*Loves diet*, ll. 28-9)

When the lady has offered to accompany him disguised as a page, he adjures her,

Be my true Mistris still, not my faign'd Page
(*Elegie xvi*, l. 14)

When we find that in the three elegies which external evidence would ascribe to Jonson, there are no less than eight instances of a usage which is not found at all in Donne's undoubted work, we have reason for asserting that here the evidence of style supports the external evidence.

That the elegies have some affinity with Donne's poetry is, of course, obvious: three such critics as Swinburne, Castelain, and Herford could not have followed a mere will-o'-the-wisp of their own fancy. But Jonson, with his keenly receptive mind, drew inspiration from the personal friend whom he esteemed "the first poet in the world in some things," just as he drew on classical poets whom he loved. Sometimes he even echoes Donne's phrases. The opening lines of *A Tale of a Tub*, addressing "Old Bishop Valentine"—

Your day and diocesse
Are very cold. All your Parishioners;
As well your Layicks, as your Quiristers,
Had need to keepe to their warme Fether-beds,
If they be sped of loves: this is no season,
To seeke new Makes in—

echo Donne's *Epithalamion on the Lady Elizabeth and Count Palatine*:

Haile Bishop Valentine, whose day this is,
All the Aire is thy Diocis,
And all the chirping Choristers
And other birds are thy Parishioners,
Thou marryest every yeare
The Lirique Larke, and the grave whispering Dove, . . .
The husband cocke, lookes out, and straight is sped,
And meets his wife, which brings her feather-bed.

In the prologue to *The Sad Shepherd*, speaking of the supposed drowning of Earine in the Trent, Jonson says:

'lasse! what knowes the head
Of a calme River, whom the feet have drown'd?

Donne in his fifth *Satire*, writes (ll. 28-30) :

Greatest and fairest Empress, know you this ?
Alas, no more then Thames calme head doth know
Whose meades her armes drowne, or whose corn o'rfloow.

And in *The New Inn*, IV, iv, 252 :

A Court remooving or an ended Play—

Jonson takes over, almost verbally, the fourteenth line of *The Calme*,

Like courts removing, or like ended playes.

These are verbal borrowings, but in assigning to Donne poem xxxviii of *The Underwoods* Herford relied on a higher test : he quoted lines 109-12, 117-22 ;

O, that you could but by dissection see
How much you are the better part of me ;
How all my Fibres by your Spirit doe move,
And that there is no life in me, but love. . . .
Your forme shines here, here fixed in my heart ;
I may dilate my selfe, but not depart.
Others by common Stars their courses run,
When I see you, then I doe see my Sun,
Till then 'tis all but darknesse, that I have,
Rather then want your light, I wish a grave.

to prove that here " we have a glimpse of the mystic passion, shot with splendour and with gloom, which womanhood provoked in the genius of Donne." He continued, " Jonson, whose highest mood towards women was an intellectual admiration, was impervious to this temper." That Jonson here rose to unusual heights is unquestionable ; but have these lines the unique quality of Donne's love-poems ? The elegy must be read as a whole, and Jonson rather than Donne stands out in the preceding lines 92-8, expressing his willingness

Rather then once displease you more, to die,
To suffer tortures, scorne, and Infamie,
What Fooles, and all their Parasites can apply ;
The wit of Ale, and *Genius* of the Malt
Can pumpe for ; or a Libell without salt
Produce ; though threatning with a coal, or chalke
On every wall, and sung wheree're I walke.

We know from Drummond that Jonson had copies of poems of Donne before they were published—*The Bracelet* and *The Calme*, which he knew by heart, and the *Metempsychosis*, which he criticized ;¹

¹ *Drummond Conversations*, ll. 117-20, 130-5.

he also sent a manuscript of Donne's *Satires* to Lady Bedford.¹ It is clear that he had a copy of *The Expostulation*, whether autograph or not it is impossible to say. But the natural inference from the evidence here put forward is that it spurred him to emulative effort, and on the theme of an offended mistress he composed a set of poems distinguishable from Donne's authentic work but retaining some trace of the subtle mind that inspired them.

¹ *Epigram xciv.*

NOTES ON THE SOURCES OF SOME INCIDENTS IN MIDDLETON'S LONDON PLAYS

By MARGERY FISHER

IT is obvious that plays like Middleton's and Dekker's, dealing with London characters, must be read with reference to day-to-day life as well as to books; yet the critic, in his zeal for source-hunting, too often thinks automatically in terms of borrowing from printed matter. The London community, though rapidly growing and developing, was still small enough in Middleton's day for gossip about criminals and neighbours, law-suits and robberies, to be the property of the town as a whole as well as of localities. It was for this community that Middleton and dramatists like him produced their vivid domestic plays, and the daily life of this community often provided, as Professor C. J. Sisson¹ has shown, the plots, as well as the background, for such plays.

Professor R. C. Bald, in an article on "The Sources of Middleton's City Comedies,"² has made it clear that many of the incidents found in Middleton's plays were so widely talked about in London that apparent printed sources must be regarded with suspicion. I do not want to labour the points which he has already made, but to add further anecdotes which he has not noted, in cases where he suggests a direct source, and to stress still more the multiplicity of stories which makes it clear that we should think of parallels rather than of sources.

(1) Mr. Bald³ says very definitely: "Greene's account of the methods used by the cony-catchers to strike up an acquaintance with their intended victims is twice used by Middleton." He quotes Greene's *A Notable Discovery of Coosnage*.⁴ The existence of other versions of this trick suggests that we cannot pin Middleton down to one source.

(a) In *Your five Gallants*⁵ Pursenet, a pickpocket, accosts

¹ *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, 1936.

² *Journal of English & German Philology*, 1934, vol. 33.

³ *J.E.G.P.*, p. 381.

⁴ 1591, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1923, pp. 18-20.

⁵ G1^v-2^r.

Pyamont as an acquaintance to induce him to take his hands out of his pockets, and then, failing in his object, apologizes for mistaking him for somebody else. Greene mentions this method more than once. In *The Second and last part of Conny-catching* ¹:

The foists . . . strained their wits to the highest string how to compasse this bounge, yet could not al their politike conceits fetch the farmer ouer, for iustle him, chat with him, offer to shake him by the hand, all would not serue to get his hand out of his pocket.²

In *The Blacke Bookes Messenger* ³ Ned Brown kisses a gentlewoman, pretending to know her, and then apologizes for the mistake, having in the meantime picked her pocket.

(b) The incident in *Michaelmas Terme*,⁴ which has been compared with *A Notable Discovery of Coosnage*,⁵ can also be paralleled in *The Thirde and last Part of Conny-catching*,⁶ where the pickpockets obtain details about a certain gentleman from his servant, and pretend to be friends of his; he confesses he does not remember them, but takes them into his confidence and is eventually robbed by them. In *Michaelmas Terme* Rearage and Salewood pump Cockstone about Easy's circumstances ⁷:

Rer : What gentleman might that bee ?

Cock : One master *Esay*, h'as good land in *Essex*,
a faire free-brested Gentleman, somewhat too open, . . .

The cheaters then accost Easy ⁸:

Sho : An *Essex* gentleman sir. *Eas* : An vnfortunate one sir.

Sho : I'me bold to salute you sir ! you knowe not master *Alsup* there.

Eas : Oh entirely well.

Sho : Indeed sir. *Eas* : Hees second to my bosome.

Sho : Ile giue you that comfort then sir, you must not want money as long as you are in towne sir.

and later run him into considerable debt.

¹ 1592, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1923, p. 40.

² In *Bartholomew Fayre* (*The Workes of Benjamin Jonson*, 1616, vol. 2, p. 44), where Cokes has his pocket picked while listening to a ballad singer, the stage-direction runs: *Edgworth gets up to him, and tickles him in the eare with a straw twice to draw his hand out of his pocket.*

³ 1592, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1924, pp. 18-19.

⁴ 1607, A⁴, B⁴.

⁵ pp. 18-20.

⁶ 1592, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1923, pp. 40-5.

⁷ A⁴.

⁸ B⁴.

This trick is also described by Rowlands in *Greenes Ghost haunting conie-catchers*¹:

There be certaine mates called Faunguests, who if they can find a fit Anuill to strike on, will learne what acquaintance he hath in the countrie, and then they will come to him, and say, I am to doe commendations to you from a friend of yours, and he gaue me this bowed sixe pence to drinke a quart of wine with you for his sake: and if he goe to the tauerne, they will not onely make him paie for the wine, but for all he drinks in besides.

It forms the basis of the 36th novel in the first part of Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure*.²

Middleton, if he depended on a printed source at all, had plenty of choice (the dates of the two plays³ make it possible for him to have used any of the above passages), but he might equally well owe his material to talk of the town.

(2) The incident in *The Phoenix*,⁴ where a gentleman rescues a knight from the officers who have arrested him by holding his hands over the eyes of one of them, crying, Who am I?, while the prisoner escapes, is related to Greene's tale in *The Thirde and last Part of*

¹ 1602, B4^r. This work is anonymous, but the initials S. R. signing the dedication are usually taken to be those of Samuel Rowlands. The pamphlet is made up largely of thefts, many from Greene's coneycatching works (as in the case above, p. 284, n. 2, and on pp. 286-7). A detailed analysis of Rowlands' borrowings has been made by E. D. McDonald (*An Example of Plagiarism among Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Samuel Rowlands' "Greenes Ghost Haunting Conie-Catchers,"* 1911, Indiana University Bulletin, vol. ix) and J. R. Bowman has also dealt with the subject (*The Works of Samuel Rowlands*, 1933, Harvard Summaries of Theses).

² 1575, pp. 71-8.

³ *Your five Gallants* has no printed date. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on March 22, 1607-8, as *Fyve Wittie Gallants*, but it is usually assigned to 1607. Cf. Bullen (*The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 1885, vol. 1, xxxiii), Fleay (*A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, vol. 2, pp. 94-5), E. K. Chambers (*The Elizabethan Stage*, 1923, vol. 3, p. 440), and M. G. Christian ("Middleton's Acquaintance with Peele's *Jests*," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1935, vol. 50, p. 760). R. C. Bald, in an article on "The Chronology of Middleton's Plays" (*Modern Language Review*, 1937, vol. 32, p. 36), puts it before the middle of 1606, from theatrical evidence.

Michaelmas Terme was first printed in 1607. Dyce, Bullen, and Chambers put the play in 1606 on the evidence of a reference to a quartering (D2^r) which they suggest was that of Sir Everard Digby on January 30, 1606 (Stow, *Annales*, 881) (cf. *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 3, pp. 432-3). R. C. Bald, however (*M.L.R.*, pp. 36-7), agrees with Fleay (*B.C.E.D.*, vol. 2, p. 91) that the reference may be to the execution of Francis Clarke on November 29, 1603, at Winchester, and adds that the account of this execution in Howes' continuation of Stow's *Annales* is signed T. M. He suggests that the mention of Newbury in *A Mad World my Masters* (1608, F4^r), taken with the present instance, could indicate that Middleton was out of London during the plague, and that both plays were probably written before 1604.

⁴ 1607, I1^r.

Conny-catching,¹ as Mr. Bald notes,² but the trick is borrowed (probably) by Rowlands for *Greenes Ghost haunting conie-catchers*.³ Either example may be connected with Middleton, or he may have heard the story independently.

(3) Mr. Bald⁴ says "The other passage to be quoted, from Greene's *The Blacke Bookes Messenger*, was probably in the authors' minds when they drew the figure of Trapdoor in Act v, Scene i, of *The Roaring Girl* in the disguise of a wounded soldier."⁵

Trapdoor's speech boasting of his campaigns⁶ :

Oh sir, from *Venice to Roma, Vecchio, Bononia, Romania, Bologna, Modena, Piacenza, & Toscana*, with all her Cities, as *Pistoia, Valterria, Montepulchena, Arrezzo*, with the *Siennesis*, and diuerse others . . .

does recall the parasites of *The Blacke Bookes Messenger*,⁷ who :

at euery worde will come in with *Strado Curtizano*, and tell you such miracles of *Madam Padilia* and *Romana Imperia*, that you will bee mad tyll you bee out of England . . .

but Greene has no geographical catalogue, the context is very different, and Middleton's debt, if any, seems more likely to be the name *Imperia*, given to the courtesan in *Blurt, Master Constable*, which Mr. Bald also mentions here.

The passage quoted from Greene appears in *Greenes Ghost haunting conie-catchers*⁸ as :

and at euerie word will come in with *Siado Curtizano*, tell you such miracles of *Madame Padilia* and *Romana Impia*, that you will be mad till you be out of England.

and (an example still nearer to Middleton) it occurs again in *The Defence of Conny catching*⁹ :

then wil he roue to *Venice*, and with a sigh, discouer the situation of the citie, how it is seated two Leagues from *Terra frenia*, in the Sea, and speake of *Rialto Treviso* and *Murano*, where they make Glasses : and to set the young getlemans teeth an edge, he wil make a long tale of *La Strado Courtizano*, wher the beautiful Curtizans dwel, . . .

Any of the above might have been used for *The Roaring Girl*, whose printed date is 1611 and date of composition probably about

¹ Pp. 23-4.

² *J.E.G.P.*, p. 381.

³ *Er*.

⁴ *J.E.G.P.*, p. 382.

⁵ I am not at present concerned with the problem of the individual authorship of this passage.

⁶ 1611, K3^r.

⁷ P. 21.

⁸ B1^r-B2^r.

⁹ 1592, C2^r.

1610¹; but the resemblance is in every case very shadowy, and may not be significant. The unemployed soldier and the cheating traveller who tried to make money out of a superficial knowledge of Europe, as Trapdoor does, were familiar figures in London at this time.

(4) Mr. Bald's statement² "Nevertheless, Greene's *Notable Discovery of Cosenage* may well have suggested to Middleton the events of the fifth act of *The Family of Love*, in which Dr. Glistler and Mistress Purge are summoned to appear before the mock court, presided over by Gerardine in disguise" may be modified by further parallels in Rowlands³ and in Chettle's *Kind-Harts Dreame*⁴ (a more general version):

How say ye by some Iuglers that can serue writs without any original, and make poore men dwelling farre off, compound with them for they knowe not what: I tell you there bee such, that by that trick can make a vacation time quicker to them than a Terme: who troubling threescore or fourescore men without cause, get of some a crowne, of others a noble, of diuers a pound, beside the ordinarie costes of the writ, to put off their appearance, when no such thing was toward.

Whereas in the above examples from Greene and Rowlands the imposture is carried out by coneycatchers to get money, in *The Famelie of Love* it is used by Gerardine as a step towards winning Maria. Moreover, in the play the summoner is not bought off but the affair is actually taken to a (mock) court and is there compounded. There is no real lechery in the play, but Gerardine relies on Glistler's sense of shame at his intentions to bring him to terms; in the other examples the trickster works on a fact or at the least on a rumour.

Middleton has in common with the two pamphlets the shame of the victim,⁵ but this is an obvious point and he need not have copied it from anyone. There are one or two hints that Greene might be the more likely source; for example, he mentions a woman,⁶ which might account for the summoning of Mrs. Purge (though the double summons follows naturally from the plot, in any case) and he also

¹ Cf. Bullen (*Middleton*, vol. 1, xxxv) and Chambers (*The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 3, pp. 296-7). Fleay (*B.C.E.D.*, vol. 1, p. 132) and R. C. Bald (*M.L.R.*, pp. 37-8) put the play at 1604-5 and 1607 respectively.

² *J.E.G.P.*, p. 379.

³ *Br¹-v*.

⁴ C. 1600, F4^v.

⁵ Cf. *The Famelie of Love*, H4^r, Greene's *A Notable Discovery of Coosenage*, p. 46, and *Greenes Ghost haunting Conie-Catchers*, Br¹-v.

⁶ Pp. 45-6.

mentions a rehearsal by the summoners,¹ which is possibly echoed by Middleton.² But coincidence between two printed versions of the same story is never sufficiently allowed for; and Gerardine recalls the possibility that gossip is the source when he says³:

so wouldst thou but assume the shape of a Proctor, I should haue the wench, thou the credit, & the whole City occasion of discourse this nyne dayes.

(5) The incident of the theft of the salt in *Your five Gallants*⁴ has generally been considered to derive from the following story in *Greenes Ghost haunting conie-catchers*⁵:

There was not long since one of our former profession, hauing intelligence of a Citizen that inuited three or foure of his friends to dinner, came a little before dinner time, and marked when the guesstes were all come: when they were all come, as he thought, knowing the goodman of the house safe (for he was not yet come from the exchange) steps vp the staires boldly, and comes into the roome where the guests were: when he comes in he salutes them, and askes if his cosen were not yet come from the Exchange. They told him no. No (saith he) me thinks he is verie long, it is past twelue of the clocke. Then after a turne or two, In faith Gentlemen (quoth my new come guest) it were good to doe something whereat we may bee merie against my cosen comes home, and to that intent I will take this Salt and hide it, that when hee misseth it, we shall see what he will say to my cosen his wife: so hee tooke the Salt, and put it in his pocket, and walked a turne or two more about the roome, within a while when y^e other guests were busie in talk, he steps downe the staires faining to make water; but when he was downe he turned downe Theeues allie, and neuer returned againe. The Citizen when he came home bid his friends welcome, and anon he mist the Salt that should be set on the table, called his wife to know if there were neuer a Salt in the house: His wife busie about dinner, tooke her husband vp, as women at such times will do, when they are a little troubled (for a little thing troubles them God wot) and asked him if he had no eyes in his head. No, nor you wife (quoth hee) if you say there be any now: So there past many shrewd and hot words betwene them. At length the guests vnwilling they should disagree on so small a trifle, they vp and told how one came in and asked for his cosen, and tooke away the Salt, meaning to make a little mirth at dinner. But when they saw he returned no more, they contented themselues with patience, and went to dinner, as men at such times vse to do, with heavy hearts and cold stomackes.

¹ Pp. 45-6.

² G1^r.

³ F2^r.

⁴ F4^r, G2^{r-v}, G4^r.

⁵ E2^r-E3^r. F. W. Chandler (*The Literature of Roguery*, 1907, vol. 1, p. 247) implies that this may be Middleton's source, and R. C. Bald (*J.E.G.P.*, p. 378) thinks the borrowing is probably direct.

The outline of the incident in Middleton is certainly the same, but there are no verbal parallels and the treatment and many of the details are very different. The central figure in Rowlands is a merchant on the Exchange,¹ where in Middleton the dinner is given by Mistress Newcut, whose husband is at sea. Middleton adds irony to the tale by making Goldstone appear in two guises, so that he can safely enjoy his own trick. One or two minor points are the same in both versions—namely, the quarrel after the theft (between Mistress Newcut and her servant in Middleton, between husband and wife in Rowlands), and the fact that the trickster calls himself cousin to the host or hostess.

If the differences between the two versions can be explained by the fact that Middleton is dramatizing a prose tale, another reference, which has not been noticed before, as far as I know, suggests that this is yet another doubtful case.

The gist of the story appears in the journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, a lawyer of some repute; this journal he kept between 1593 and 1616, as he says ² "as a book of observations for my age or children." Wilbraham was Reader at Gray's Inn in 1598 and in September of that year he recorded a conversation with some of his colleagues in which the following subjects were discussed ³:

In Mr. Milles chamber ove [*sic*] Fuller, Pelham, Barker, & Altam: divers tales of cosenages told: especiallie of false message and tokens: & of straungers to take horses as hostellers in Inns & ride away with them: one agreed for a load of hay in Smithfield: to be delivered at Bell *alibi*: goes to the Inn-keeper at Bell and sells him the load for lesse, & takes present money: that bringes the innkeeper to Smithfield & bad the carter deliver his load to the innkeeper: & himself estopped.

Item one came to an alderman as invited guest counterfeit & took away a guilt salt, in absence of the wief, in merriment by consent of other guests: & never returned:

Item one was rolling a packe of bed-ding downe the stairs to have stolen them: & the owner coming, he said that was the sign of the Dragon, & he went to have left the pack ther: thother told him he mistook the house like a knave, & so helped him out with his owne goodes: who was never found after.

¹ This might have suggested to Middleton the remark made by Mistress Newcut to her servant (G2):

"Why how now sirrah, vpon twelue of the clock, & not the cloth laide yet . . . must we needs keepe Exchange time still."

² *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham*, ed. H. S. Scott, 1902, Camden Miscellanies, no. 10, p. 57.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-22.

At the L. Warden's of 5 ports 50 coseners in his Lordship's livery were attending & deceived manie with false tokens & message.

One passing in the streete, a maid to whom he bad good morow was asked what he was: she answered 'Forsoth, Sir, he is Cales knight by his occupation:' per Carew, 'Th.

Wm. Gerrard said that he talking with one a yoman at Harow hill, they marvelled at the great purchases of Sir John Puckering L. keper: the yoman said 'I knew him of late in meane estate but now marvaile not at his soddaine greatnes: for it is the operacion of a L. kepership to purchase everie yere 500 pounds.'

Per Bacon *ex domino Thesaur(ar)io*: the L. of Burgaveny had morgaged that howse: the King having an ynkling therof at his meeting with him said 'God morow my L. of Burgaveny without Burgaveny': the Lord more boldlie then discretlie said to the King 'God morow my liege lord, King of Fraunce without Fraunce.'

The phrase "divers tales of cosenages told" leaves it doubtful whether these tales were gossip, fresh or revived from the past, or from books. The latter half of the conversation seems concerned with gossip, though partly at second hand. Of the earlier part, the load of hay incident can be found in *Mery Tales*, *Wittie Questions and Quicke Answeres*¹ and again, very little altered, in *Pasquils Iests, mixed with Mother Bunches Merriments*.² The relation between jest books and real life is intricate, but most of the stories seem to have been true at one time or another, and even those of Continental origin may actually have promoted trickery in London.

The tale of stealing the bedding can be paralleled in Greene's *The Thirde and last Part of Conny-catching*³ and here again Wilbraham and his friends may have been recalling the book or an actual incident they had heard of. Greene's connection with the low life of London was a very close one.

Probably a common incident lies behind all these versions of the story of the salt. If Wilbraham's conversation is concerned with contemporary life, there is nothing departmental about the coney-catching tales which it outlines, and it is possible that Middleton had heard this particular one himself, independently of Rowlands.

¹ Ed. W. C. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare Jest-Books*, 1864, vol. 1, pp. 142-5. *Mery Tales* was printed by Berthelet about 1535. It contained 114 anecdotes, and a further 26 were added in 1567.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 3, pp. 40-1. The work dates from 1604, but the jest is, of course, earlier.

³ Pp. 46-9.

The interval of time, though long, is not prohibitive; a community's memory for scandal is apt to be capricious.

The element of surprise must have been relatively unimportant in situations like this and in cases of ingenious trickery, since the incidents were to such an extent common knowledge. In Middleton at least the deftness and even brilliance with which the tricks are given dramatic and psychological point, the variety and speed with which they are produced, and their relevance to city life, were probably compensation enough to an audience which was already familiar with many of them.¹

(6) Finally, the cheating of the mercer by Frank Beaufort and young George Cressingham in *Any Thing for a Quiet Life*² has several interesting analogues.³

Laurence's remark to Nan in Greene's *A Disputation, Betweene a Hee Conny-catcher, and a Shee Conny-catcher*⁴:

I cannot deny Nan, but you haue set down strange Presidents of womens preiuditial wits, but yet though you be Crosbites, Foysts, and Nips, yet you are not good Lifts, which is a great helpe to our facultie, to filche a boulte of Satten or Veluet . . .

¹ The popularity of the theme of stealing silver can be seen from the following list. In *Raiseis Ghost* (? 1605, Cr¹-²) Snell acts as a servant in order to get at the table silver and gilt; *The Pleasant Conceites of Old Hobson* (1607, F¹-F²) describes how a thief lifts a silver cup from a banquet; cf. also Dekker's *The Belman of London* (1608, G³-⁷), Antony Copley's *Wits, Fits, and Fancies* (1614, Y²), and Henry Parrot's epigram in *The Mous-Trap* (1606, E¹), repeated in *Epigrams* (1608, E¹) and *Springs for Woodcocks* (1613, O⁸), which may hark back to Middleton's play. An elaborate tale of the same kind can be found in Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1575, Part I, pp. 277-9).

² 1662, C³-D².

³ Printed as late as 1662, *Any Thing for a Quiet Life* is usually dated between 1617 and 1621. R. C. Bald (*M.L.R.*, p. 42) gives 1621, quoting F. L. Lucas, who (*The Complete Works of John Webster*, 1927, vol. 4, p. 65) gives several historical allusions to support this date, notably the restoration of the Standard in Cheapside, completed in 1621 (cf. *Any Thing for a Quiet Life*, B¹, and *The Sunne in Aries*, 1621, B²). Schelling (*Elizabethan Playwrights*, 1925, p. 187) puts the play "after the twenties." Dyce (*The Works of Thomas Middleton*, vol. 4, p. 426) dated it as early as 1617 and supposed that the reference to the voyage to Guiana (B²) was to the first voyage under Raleigh in 1595, but Bullen (*Middleton*, vol. 1, lxxxvii) and A. W. Ward (*A History of English Dramatic Literature*, 1899, vol. 2, p. 523 and n.) suggested the allusion was to the last voyage and pointed to a date soon after 1617. H. D. Sykes and Fleay put it much later, Sykes (*Notes and Queries*, 12th ser., vol. 9, p. 226), c. 1626, because of a supposed allusion to *A Cure for a Cuckold*, and Fleay (*B.C.E.D.*, vol. 2, p. 105) in 1623; but Lucas (*Webster*, vol. 4, p. 65) thinks the allusion may be to an actual custom rather than to the play bearing the name. On the whole 1621 seems to be the most likely date. I am not at the moment considering the claims of H. D. Sykes (*N. & Q.*, 12th ser., vol. 9), Lucas (*Webster*, vol. 4), and E. H. C. Oliphant (*N. & Q.*, 12th ser., vol. 10) that much of this play should be given to Webster.

⁴ 1592, ed. G. B. Harrison, 1923, p. 30. This is repeated in *Theeves Falling Out* (1637, C²).

and the complicated story in *Greenes Newes both from Heauen and Hell*¹ show this to be another widely canvassed example of petty crime. Closer than the above instances, however, are two stories in *A C. Mery Talys*² and *The First and Best Part of Scoggins Jest*.³

In *A C. Mery Talys* a churchman is told that a scholar, suffering from the chincough (i.e., whooping cough), begs for three sips of the chalice to cure him, while the scholar is told that the churchman will give him the sarcanet he covets. Scoggin with the same story cheats a mercer to whom he owes money. So in Middleton's play the two young men promise Water-Camlet, a mercer, that if he sends his man with them, Sweetball, the barber, will pay him for their purchases; while they prepare the barber by telling him the mercer's boy is infected with venereal disease and very bashful about his trouble. In every case the cheater makes off while the dupes are trying to understand each other.

If these stories have the technique of their trick in common with Middleton, a later version in *Ratseis Ghost*⁴ has still more. This collection of tales, like its predecessor, *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey*, is a curious mixture of first-hand journalism and literary theft; though concerned with a real person, a thief who was hanged on March 26, 1605, it uses Ratsey as a convenient centre for stories many of which go back to a much earlier date.⁵ The scenes in *Any Thing for a Quiet Life* compare closely with *Ratseis Ghost* in that the pox is used and not the chincough, as in the jest books. The context differs only in so far as Ratsey is trying to get rid of a cozenner who is pestering a gentleman for money. Middleton fills out the incident with puns and crude jokes, while the non-dramatic tale is brief and to the point, its emphasis mainly on Ratsey's in-

¹ 1593, C2^v-D1^v.

² Ed. W. C. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare Jest-Books*, vol. 1, pp. 60-2. The collection dates from c. 1525.

³ Ed. W. C. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare Jest-Books*, vol. 2, pp. 137-40. Thomas Colwell entered *Geystes of Scoggin* in S. R. 1565-6, but the present edition is that of 1626.

⁴ F1^r-F2^r. The work is not dated, but Ratsey was hanged, as I have said, on March 26, 1605, and "the Second parte of (his) lif with the reste of his mad Prances," as it was called there, was entered in S. R. on May 31 of that year. *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey* was entered on May 2, with two ballads, not extant, on the same subject.

⁵ Thus the anecdote of the picklock in *The Life and Death of Gamaliel Ratsey* (D2^r-D3^r) is almost identical with that in *The Second and last part of Conny-catching* (pp. 55-9). In *Ratseis Ghost* (E1^r-E2^r) Snell and Shorthose scrape acquaintance with a potential victim by using what they have overheard of his home and neighbours, as in Greene and others (cf. pp. 284-6).

genuity. It seems likely that somewhere in these three stories lies the foundation of Middleton's scenes, though here again real life may in fact be the origin, although we have lost any direct trace of the incident.¹

To conclude, we cannot expect to ascertain, in many cases, the exact source of such incidents as I have quoted from Middleton's London plays. The vitality of these plays depends for us largely on variety and vividness of incident and fullness of historical content, but when they were first produced, no doubt they won applause partly for their power to evoke a pleasurable and often malicious satisfaction in the members of the audience as they recognized hits at a neighbour or a public figure, references to a recent crime, anecdotes of their daily lives. Though we may sometimes trace social or domestic allusions to their origin, actual sources must be admitted to be largely doubtful.

¹ William Cartwright apparently imitates Middleton in *The Ordinary* (1651, produced c. 1635, E4'-E6'), where Shape, a cheater, takes a mercer to a surgeon to be paid. We have only one scene, but it is evident that the same plot was in Cartwright's mind. He suggests in his prologue (A2') that he is writing at second hand, not directly of real life. There are several other reminiscences of Middleton in this play. The scene (D3'-D5') where the rogues feign a quarrel in order to induce Andrew to make peace with a drink recalls *A Faire Quarrell* (G2'-G4'); Moth's speech (E1') may owe something to *The Mayor of Quinborough* (G4'); while the position of Littleworth, who moves among the cheaters in disguise in order to expose them, is not unlike that of Fitsgrave in *Your Five Gallants* or Phoenix in *The Phoenix*, though a familiar enough situation in any case.

ROCHESTER, DRYDEN, AND THE ROSE-STREET AFFAIR

By J. HAROLD WILSON

THE accepted belief that the Earl of Rochester was responsible for Dryden's cudgelling at the hands of three rascals on December 18, 1679, rests upon three items of evidence: a statement by Anthony à Wood, a letter from Rochester to Savile, dated November 21, 1679, and, most important of all, an undated letter to Savile in which Rochester admitted that he was "out of favour with a certain Poet," but would "leave the repartee to *Black Will* with a cudgel." It is my purpose here to examine the value of these items as evidence of Rochester's guilt.

In his study of Buckingham's life, Wood wrote:

. . . in Nov. (or before) an. 1679, there being *An Essay upon Satyr* spread about the city in MS. wherein many gross reflections were made on Ludovisa dutchess of Portsmouth and John Wilmot earl of Rochester, they therefore took it for a truth that Dryden was the author; whereupon one or both hiring three men to cudgel him, they effected their business in the said coffee-house at 8 of the clock at night on the 16th of Dec. 1679;¹

Beside this statement must be set a hitherto ignored entry for December 16, 1679, in Wood's "Memoirs":

John Dryden the poet, being at Will's coffee house in Covent garden, was about 8 at night soundly cudgelled by 3 men, the reason, as 'tis supposed, because he had reflected on certain persons in *Absolom and Achitophel*.²

Obviously the two statements do not agree. In the second, Wood not only fails to name the culprits, but he is confused about the cause of the beating, referring it to Dryden's *Absolom and Achitophel*, published in 1681, and certainly written not earlier than 1680. He is likewise confused about the exact date, which was Thursday, December 18, and about the location of the beating,

¹ *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, 1813, IV. 210.

² *Athenæ*, I. lxxxvii.

which was not "in" or "at" Will's Coffee-house, but in Rose-Alley, when Dryden was on his way home.¹ Wood implies that only Rochester and Portsmouth were attacked in the *Essay*, while actually Rochester shared honours with Buckingham, Shaftesbury, Halifax, Sedley, and many others.² Portsmouth was barely referred to in passing (not by name) as one of the "beastly brace," the King's mistresses.

Wood is, to my knowledge, the only one among contemporary biographers, diarists, or letter-writers to accuse Rochester, and the only writer who even hazarded a guess at the identity of the Rose-Street culprits. Not only is he confused about the whole affair, but by his phrase "one or both" he practically admits that his information was uncertain.³ I conclude, therefore, that his evidence is mere hearsay, probably long after the event, and thus incompetent.

The second item of evidence is Rochester's letter to Henry Savile, on November 21, 1679. In part Rochester wrote :

I have sent you herewith a Libel, in which my own share is not the least ; the King having perus'd it, is no ways disatisfyed with his : the Author is apparently Mr. [Dryden], his Patron my Lord [Mulgrave] having a Panegerick in the midst, upon which happen'd a handsome Quarrell between his L[ordship] and Mr[s]. B[ulkeley] at the Dutchess of P[ortsmouth's] ; she call'd him : The Heroe of the Libel, and Complimented him upon having made more Cuckolds, than any man alive ; to which he answer'd, She very well knew one he never made, nor never car'd to be imploy'd in making.—Rogue and Bitch ensued, till the King, taking his Grand-father's Character upon him, became the Peacemaker.⁴

This passage is mis-interpreted by V. de Sola Pinto in his study of Rochester.⁵ Mis-reading the letter, he decides that "the

¹ According to Scott (*Dryden*, I. 204), the date was Monday, the 18th. The date, but not the day of the week, is confirmed by newspapers of the time. *Mercurius Domesticus* for December 19, in a first page item, refers the affair to "the 18th instant," and on the second page prints an advertisement referring to the affair as of "Thursday the 18th." *True Domestic Intelligence* for December 23 has two news items on the subject : the first, on p. 1, refers to "Thursday night last," the second, on p. 2, speaks of the "17th instant." This was probably a printer's slip. The date of the affair is further confirmed by the repetition of the advertisement in *The London Gazette* for December 29, where it appears again as "Thursday the 18th instant." All the newspapers agree on Rose-Street as the location.

² Cf. Maurice Irvine, "Characters in Mulgrave's 'Essay on Satyr,'" *Studies in Philology*, October 1937.

³ It may be significant also that the affair is not mentioned in Wood's life of Rochester, published in the first edition of the *Athena*, 1691-92 (III. 1,228-34). The life of Buckingham is from the dubious second edition, published from Wood's papers in 1721.

⁴ *Familiar Letters*, reprinted by John Hayward, *Works of John Wilmot Earl of Rochester*, Letter XV.

⁵ *Rochester, Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, 199-205.

lampoon had put Louise de Keroualle [Duchess of Portsmouth] into a furious rage," and that it was she who had been the actual instigator of the Rose-Street affair.¹ Then, because of the "Black Will" letter,² which Pinto dates in 1679, he reasons that Rochester was aware of the Duchess' intentions, but refused to interfere, thus becoming a kind of accessory before the fact. Pinto conjectures further that Savile had written Rochester in answer to the letter of November 21, and had begged forgiveness for Dryden. Therefore, according to his argument, the "Black Will" letter must have been written as a reply to Savile sometime between November 21 and December 18.

Obviously, since so much depends upon this undated letter, the third item of evidence, and the one commonly accepted as the most convincing proof of Rochester's guilt, it is necessary to date it as accurately as possible. The pertinent section of the letter follows:

You write me word, that I'm out of favour with a certain Poet, whom I have ever admir'd, for the disproportion of him and his Attributes: He is a Rarity which I cannot but be fond of, as one would be of a Hog that could fiddle, or a singing Owl. If he falls upon me at the Blunt, which is his very good Weapon in Wit, I will forgive him, if you please, and leave the Repartee to *Black Will*, with a Cudgel.³ And now, dear *Harry*, if it may agree with your Affairs, to shew yourself in the Country this Summer, contrive such a Crew together, as may not be asham'd of passing by Woodstock; and if you can debauch Alderman G—y,⁴ we will make a shift to delight his Gravity. I am sorry for the declining D.⁵ and would have you generous to her at this time, for this is true Pride, and I delight in it.

¹ Pinto, p. 203. The story is told in more detail by Colonel Edward Cooke, November 22, 1679 (*Ormonde Papers*, v. 242). From him we learn that the quarrel was between Mulgrave and Mrs. (or Lady) Sophia Bulkeley, wife of the Honourable Henry Bulkeley, Master of the Household to Charles II. Pinto's mistake is no doubt the result of a misprint in Rochester's letter, the dropping of the s from *Mrs.* The misprint is corrected in the second edition of the *Familiar Letters*, 1696, i. 48.

² Reprinted by Hayward, *Works, Letters XVI*. This letter is commonly assigned to 1679 because of the seeming relation to the assault on Dryden.

³ *Black Will* has eluded me. The phrase may be an unrecorded cant term. On the other hand, Rochester may have had reference to an actual character, perhaps a member of the so-called "black guard."

⁴ Possibly Henry Guy, no "Alderman" but a fellow Groom of the Chamber to the King. He was evidently a serious-minded, ambitious man; hence the jocular appellation. On the other hand, Buckingham may have been meant. See Arthur Bryant, *King Charles II*, 241.

⁵ The "declining D." is certainly the Duchess of Portsmouth, who is often referred to in the Rochester-Savile correspondence. Rochester speaks of her also as "the Duchess," "the Duchess of P," or "the D. of P." In the second edition of the *Familiar Letters*, i. 6, the phrase is the "declining D—ss."

Now the tone and content of this letter are sufficient to show that it was written by Rochester in the country to his friend at the court in London.¹ But in November and December of 1679, Savile was in Paris, where he had been on various diplomatic missions (except for one brief trip home) since July 14, 1678.² It was to Savile in Paris that Rochester's letter of November 21 was addressed.³ Furthermore, Rochester invites his friend to come "this Summer" for a visit at Woodstock. Surely if he had been writing in late November he would not have used such a phrase. It is much more likely that he was writing in the spring or early summer. If so, the latest possible date for the letter would be the spring of 1678, for Savile was continually abroad after July of that year.

But if the "Black Will" letter was written at any time before November 21, 1679, Pinto's theory of an accessory before the fact breaks down, and our second item of evidence, Rochester's letter of November 21, turns out to be irrelevant, and no evidence at all. We are left, then, with only the vague threat implied in the "Black Will" letter, which must have been written some time between May 2, 1674, when Rochester became Ranger of Woodstock,⁴ and July 14, 1678.

It has always been taken for granted that the "certain Poet" mentioned in the letter was Dryden. In spite of my objection to the accepted date, 1679, for the letter, I believe that Dryden was indeed the poet referred to, and that evidence for this belief can be found in the relations between Dryden and Rochester after 1673, the last date at which we can be sure the two were still on friendly terms.⁵

At some time between 1673 and 1678 Rochester attacked Dryden

¹ The first part of the letter (which was written in answer to a "Gazette" from Savile) is a cynical disquisition on the folly of seeking to be "great in our little Government."

² Cf. *Savile Correspondence*, letters of November 8 and 22, December 16 and 26, 1679. Savile's letters are dated according to the Gregorian Calendar, or ten days later than the calendar used in England.

³ The only extant letters of Rochester to Savile after July 1678 and before 1680 are all addressed to the diplomat at Paris. They are dated September 5, 1678 (Hayward), June 25, 1679, November 1, 1679, and November 21, 1679. Savile was in England sometime between the last of October, 1678, and the first of March, 1678/9. That there were no letters from Rochester during the spring of 1678/9 is shown by Savile's complaint in a letter dated June 30 (N.S.), 1679, that he had been four months forgotten by Rochester (*Bath MSS*, 180).

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers Domestic*, May 2, 1674.

⁵ See Dryden's letter to Rochester, July 1673, in Scott, *Works*, xviii. 81.

in a famous satire, *An Allusion to Horace*.¹ To this attack Dryden replied in his preface to *All for Love*, published January 31, 1677/8. We have no certain knowledge of any other relations between the two poets.

In *An Allusion to Horace* Dryden was attacked for hasty writing, for seeking popular favour, for carping criticism, dullness, and bluntness of wit. Yet, admitted Rochester, "His Excellencies more than Faults abound."

Nor dare I from his sacred Temple tear
The Laurel, which he best deserves to wear.

In short, Rochester, disliking the man (and perhaps his "foolish Patron" Mulgrave), admitted his ability as a poet.

This is exactly the attitude expressed in the "Black Will" letter. Rochester had always admired (wondered at) the "certain Poet" for "the disproportion of him and his Attributes." He was as much a rarity as "a Hog that could fiddle, or a singing Owl." Rochester despised the man, but admitted his ability as a poet. Nor are the words "Hog" and "Owl" to be dismissed as purely accidental; Dryden's blunt, heavy figure was an easy mark to shoot at.²

Finally, there is a striking parallelism of both phrase and thought. In the *Allusion*, Rochester had said of Dryden (who would be a wit after the court fashion):

But when he would be sharp, he still was blunt,
To frisk and frolic Fancy he'd cry—

And in the letter, "If he fall upon me at the Blunt, which is his very good Weapon in wit. . . ."

The "certain Poet," I submit, was Dryden, and the occasion for Dryden's vexation was in all probability Rochester's *Allusion*. It is a reasonable assumption that, not long after the satire had been read in the coffee-houses and passed though the circle of wits,

¹ There was also *A Trial of the Poets for the Bays* (circa 1677) in which Dryden was dismissed very briefly. However, it is doubtful if this was by Rochester. For the controversy on the subject, see Prinz, *Rochester*, pp. 100-104, G. Greene, "Otway and Mrs. Barry," *T. L. S.*, April 16, 1931, and D. M. Walmsley, "A Trial of the Poets," *T. L. S.*, May 28, 1931.

² See, for example, Shadwell's attack on Dryden in *The Tory-Poets, a Satyr*, 1683:

His shapeless Body hangs an hundred ways
The Poet looks just like a heap of Plays.

the gossip Savile had heard of Dryden's anger and had written word thereof to Rochester.

But Rochester's satire was certainly written well before 1678, when Dryden's reply was published. I suggest that it was written in the winter of 1675-76. The poem is not only an attack upon Dryden, it is also a discussion of many contemporary poets and playwrights. Wherever Rochester specifies a particular work of a writer, his reference is never to a date later than September 1675.¹ Moreover, he speaks of "puzzling Otway" having tried in vain to produce a successful play. This could only refer to the amateurish *Alcibiades* (September 1675). Otway's second play, *Don Carlos* (June 1676), was written (according to Otway) under Rochester's patronage and was a great success.

Now if the *Allusion* was written in the winter of 1675-76, it follows that the "Black Will" letter was probably written in the spring or early summer of 1676. A final item of evidence confirming this date is found in the last line of the letter, Rochester's reference to the "declining D."

Hayward explains this reference by asserting that the Duchess of Portsmouth had been passing through a serious illness in the winter of 1679.² There is no evidence to support his contention.³ It is much more probable that Rochester's reference is to the sufferings of the Duchess in the spring of 1675/6, sufferings not so much the result of illness as of her loss of the King's affections to the Duchess of Mazarine. As early as February 11, 1675/6, Portsmouth's melancholy was noted by Lady Vaughan.⁴ On April 19 Lady Chaworth spoke of conflicting reports of the Duchess being out of favour.⁵ On April 25, Charles Hatton insisted that the lady's illness was "encreased by somebody's visiting ye Duchesse Mazarine at my Lady Harvey's house."⁶ And from William Harbord and the Earl of Orrery we learn that by May 27 Portsmouth was at Bath, obviously ailing and completely out of favour.⁷ There

¹ For example, he speaks of Lee's *Nero* (May 1674) and *Sophonisba* (April 1675), but he has no comment on either *Gloriana* (January 1675/6) or the more famous *Rival Queens* (January 1676/7).

² Hayward, *Works*, p. 395.

³ See the several references to Portsmouth's activities at this time in the *Diary of the Life and Times of Charles II*, by Henry Sidney, ed. H. W. Blencowe, 1843, pp. 190, 196, 206, 215-9. In the fall of 1677 Portsmouth had been seriously ill, but by mid-winter she was reported cured. See Savile's letters to Rochester, *Bath Mss.*, II. 159, 160; and Lady Chaworth, *Rutland Papers*, II. 45.

⁴ Lady Russell's Letters, p. 31.

⁵ *Rutland Papers*, II. 28.

⁶ *Hatton Correspondence*, I. 122.

⁷ *Essex Papers*, II. 50-1.

were other periods when the Duchess was ill; there was no other when she went, temporarily at least, into such an eclipse. Surely Rochester's use of the word "declining" was deliberate, and to be taken in a double sense.

The explanation for Rochester's magnanimous attitude is to be found in two undated letters to Savile (numbered XI and XVII in Hayward's edition) which deal with a common topic: a difficulty between Rochester and the Duchess. The letters seem to be in close chronological sequence, for the first (XI), in which Rochester bewails the "severity, you say the D. of P. . . shews to me," contains also the request that Savile use his influence with the lady to obtain an explanation for the "severity." The second (XVII) is a very passion of denial. Evidently Savile had used his interest to good effect, had written Rochester that he was reported as saying various unpleasant things about the Duchess, and the Earl replied wildly that he had said nothing of the kind, whatever it was.¹

Now both these letters must date from the winter of 1675-76, for, as a postscript to Letter XI, Rochester wrote, "I wish my Lord Halifax joy of everything, and of his Daughter to boot." Elizabeth, daughter of the Earl of Halifax (Savile's brother), and his second wife, Gertrude, was born in November or December 1675.² Savile must have written the news to Rochester, whose congratulations would have followed soon after.

It seems, then, that the sequence of events was as follows: Rochester, in retirement during the winter of 1675-76 (perhaps banished for one of his more outrageous libels),³ was distressed by the news of Portsmouth's anger and "severity." But by the spring of 1675/6 the Duchess was herself out of favour with the King and ill to boot. Magnanimously, then, Rochester wrote in the "Black

¹ "By that God that made me," he wrote, "I have no more offended her in Thought, Word, or Deed, no more imagin'd or utter'd the least Thought to her contempt or Prejudice, than I have plotted Treason, conceal'd Arms, Train'd Regiments for a Rebellion."

² On July 8, 1675 (*Savile Corr.*), Savile, in a letter to Halifax, referred to Lady Halifax's "great belly." On September 16 (N.S.), 1676, he concluded a letter to Halifax with the phrase, "My service to my Lady and my niece." Elizabeth was born between the two dates, but obviously much nearer the first.

³ In Letter XI Rochester reminds Savile that he and Guy had promised to come for him soon. "I shall scarce think of coming, till you call me, as not having many prevalent Motives to draw me to the Court, if it be so that my Master has no need of my Service, nor my Friends of my Company." In contemporary sources I find no reference to Rochester's activities after October 29, 1675 (*C. S. P. D.*, 367), or before the report of his unhappy affair at Epsom in late June 1676 (*Essex Papers*, II. 59).

Will " letter that he was sorry for the declining Duchess and would have Savile generous to her, " for such is true Pride, and I delight in it."

I submit, then, that the " Black Will " letter was written in the spring of 1675/6, because, first, in tone and attitude it agrees with Rochester's *An Allusion to Horace*, the probable cause of Dryden's anger, written not later than the winter of 1675-76 ; second, because of its reference to the " declining D.," applicable only to the spring of 1675/6 ; and, third, because of its reference to a quarrel between Rochester and the Duchess of Portsmouth, which took place in the winter of 1675-76.

If this be so, surely we cannot accept as evidence of guilt a vague and careless threat uttered nearly four years before the crime was committed. Rochester failed to carry out his threat in the spring of 1677/8, when Dryden did indeed fall upon him " at the Blunt " in the preface to *All for Love* ; I contend that he did not fulfil it in December 1679.

One final word remains to be said in Rochester's defence. It is yet to be shown that he accepted Dryden's authorship of the *Essay on Satyr*. Modern critics have wondered that Dryden was ever suspected of writing so poor a piece. As Saintsbury put it, " No literary judge could for one moment connect him with the shambling doggerel lines which distinguish the *Essay on Satire* in its original form." ¹ Prinz, agreeing, ascribed Rochester's lack of judgment to his " intelligible anger at the gross malice of the attack." ² That Rochester was a keen and sensitive critic with a wholesome respect for Dryden as a poet we know from the *Allusion to Horace*. That he was not, at least audibly, angry at the *Essay on Satyr* we know from his letter to Savile on November 21, 1679. Finally, Rochester himself suggests his doubt with the phrase, " Its author is *apparently* Mr.——" On such evidence, I see no reason for the hasty generalization that Rochester accepted Dryden as the author of the satire.

I conclude that, whoever it was who instigated the cudgelling of John Dryden, there is no proof of Rochester's guilt. Wood's evidence is confused and incompetent ; the letter of November 21, 1679 (basis for Pinto's " accessory " theory), is irrelevant ; and the " Black Will " letter, written nearly four years before the event, is immaterial.

¹ Scott-Saintsbury, *Dryden*, 1. 70.

² Prinz, *Rochester*, p. 193.

JOHNSON'S REVISION OF *THE RAMBLER*¹

By C. B. BRADFORD

I

THOUGH students of Johnson know that the text of the *Rambler* was radically altered after its original appearance, the results of a systematic collation of the various editions have not heretofore been presented. The purpose of this study is to present the facts disclosed by such a comparison, and to illustrate by so doing Johnson's method of composition. As every reader of Boswell knows, the *Rambler* was written in haste, but it is not so well known that at the earliest opportunity the text was carefully corrected. Johnson, indeed, does not seem to have considered the act of composition ended when a work had appeared in print; for, as we shall see, he rewrote many portions of the *Rambler*. It must, however, be stated at the outset that Johnson never greatly altered his original ideas, but only attempted to improve his expression. In the pages that follow, three things are attempted: first, the establishment of the text of the *Rambler*; secondly, the study of characteristic changes; finally, a summary of the results of this investigation.

II

Johnson made two complete and several partial revisions of the text of the *Rambler*. Since there was little or no attempt to correct the original sheets as they appeared in London,² the first revision

¹ Johnson's revisions have been twice studied: first, by Alexander Chalmers for his edition of the *Rambler* for the *British Essayists*. Chalmers made a complete collation, during which he discovered more than 6,000 variants; his discussion of the text indicates that he was thoroughly acquainted with it. (Chalmers' copy of the folio *Rambler* with his collations written in the margins has recently been added to the R. B. Adam Collection at the University of Rochester. I have not as yet seen it.) Secondly, by D. Nichol Smith (*Johnson and Boswell Revised*, Oxford, 1928, pp. 9-15), who, basing his conclusions on a collation of *Rambler* 180, foresaw many of the results of the present study.

² There are few textual differences between copies of the folio *Rambler* which I have examined. (This statement does not take into account *Rambler* 1, which appears in some copies in a revised form incorporating most of the changes which Johnson made for the first collected edition of 1752.) The spacing is changed occasionally (see No. 4, folio, p. 22), but only rarely will an actual misprint be corrected (see No. 98, folio, p. 582).

was the partial correction of the folio text which Johnson made for the Edinburgh reprint begun by his friend James Elphinston on June 1, 1750.¹ A number of changes were introduced into this edition, which may be illustrated here. In the first place, the text of several mottoes which had been printed with errors in the folio was altered. For example, in number 3 the third line of the motto read :

Nec sumit aut *poscit* secures

instead of :

Nec sumit aut *ponit* secures

and the correct version first appeared in the Edinburgh edition.² Secondly, verbal changes were made, for some of which Johnson was probably responsible.³ A few examples will indicate the nature of these changes. In number 40 (folio, p. 237) Johnson confused the names of two of his characters and wrote "Felicia" when he should have written "Floretta"; this was corrected in the Edinburgh edition. In number 171 (folio, p. 1,022) the following reading, probably a misprint, appeared :

unqualified for *Cabinet* offices

this becomes :

unqualified for *laborious* offices

Finally, in number 194 (folio, p. 1,159), Johnson left an incomplete sentence which was rectified by the omission of "which." It is, therefore, probable that Johnson emended certain errors in the original *Rambler* almost immediately, for some at least of these changes were certainly made by the author.

On April 1, 1751, Johnson agreed to a collected edition of the *Rambler*,⁴ and he probably began his revision of the text soon thereafter. This revision was extensive and thorough, for there were alterations made in every number of the *Rambler*. Changes

¹ See *European Magazine* (Nov. 1809), LVI. 363. Probably Johnson and Elphinston share responsibility for these corrections.

² There were similar corrections made in numbers 50, 117, 129, 145, 163, 199, and 201; but not all the mottoes which appear incorrectly in the folio *Rambler* were changed in the Edinburgh edition.

³ Particularly in numbers 4, 5, 18, 20, 37, 38, 40, 45, 48, 50, 55, 70, 89, 95, 100, 102, 117, 127, 132, 140, 143, 152, 159, 168, 171, 174, 176, 180, 194, 200, and 208.

⁴ The MS. contract for this edition formed lot No. 738 at the sale of the library of Jerome Kern at the Anderson Galleries, January 7-10, 1929. It is printed in Nichol's *Literary Anecdotes* and in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1812 (pt. 1, p. 313). The arrangement was for 70 numbers (two volumes), but the plan was extended to include four, which were advertised for sale in January 1752 (see *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1752, p. 47).

in the wording are most common, though occasionally Johnson made additions or excisions. During this revision Johnson corrected some of the mistakes in the mottoes and quotations, which from this time on show no further changes; he also rectified most of the actual errors that had appeared in the original edition.

The second and final complete revision was made for the fourth or 1756 edition of the *Rambler* in four volumes. The copyright had changed hands, and this edition was printed by Strahan for Millar, Hodges, Rivington, Baldwin, and Collins. Although the volumes did not appear until 1756, the following entry in Strahan's ledger indicates that Johnson made his revision in 1754:

Jan. 7, 1756: Printing *Rambler*, etc. N.B. This book was all printed off, except the last two sheets, 16 months ago.¹

Upon examining the final volume of the fourth edition, we find that the last two sheets contain the index by Flexman that so aroused Johnson's wrath.² This revision of the *Rambler* is by far the most interesting; for though Johnson made almost no additions, he cut out many passages, and in general simplified his syntax. The changes made in 1751 probably outnumber those made in 1754, but the latter are more important.

It is impossible to prove that Johnson took any further interest in the text of the *Rambler*. The index entries of which he complained to Boswell³ were never changed, and this fact seems to indicate that control of the text had passed from Johnson's hands. The ninth edition of 1779 has, however, some interest, for in this edition a number of misprints that had crept into the text by a process of slow corruption were corrected. As far as can be discovered, these corrections were the only changes made. It seems hardly likely that Johnson, in 1779 at work on the *Lives of the Poets*, was responsible for these improvements. Perhaps the corrections were made by referring to the first collected edition of 1752 or to the fourth edition of 1756.⁴

¹ Austen-Leigh, R.A., *Story of a Printing House*, London, 1912, p. 49.

² Collation: B-L¹²; signatures M¹²-N⁴ make up the index of 32 unnumbered pages.

³ Boswell, J., *Life of Johnson*, eds. Hill-Powell, Oxford, 1934, IV. 325.

⁴ I have noticed two readings in the ninth edition which are there introduced for the first time: one of these is the first example quoted in the text. Johnson wrote originally "without being enlivened by Examples and Characters," and allowed the reading to stand in the first collected edition. In 1754 the passage read "without the imitation of examples and characters." The word "imitation" was changed to "illustration" in the ninth edition. Perhaps the word "imitation"

The following illustrate the dozen or more misprints corrected in the ninth edition :

- No. 23, par. 9 : without the *imitation* of examples (editions 4, 5, 6, and 8)]
without the *illustration* of examples.
No. 43, par. 5 : defects inseparable from humanity (editions 4, 5, 6,
and 8)] defects *being* inseparable, etc.

These indicate that some attempt was made to emend the text in preparing the ninth edition of the *Rambler*, though it cannot now be determined how these changes were made or who made them.

In the light of present knowledge, the fourth edition should be the basic text of the *Rambler*. It contains, so far as we know, Johnson's final corrections, and though misprints have crept into it, these are relatively few and can be easily corrected by collation with the original and first collected editions. Should the improbable happen and a third edition turn up, it may be of value in determining the text, but at the present time it is safe to say that the fourth edition must be the basis of any critical edition of the *Rambler*.¹

III ²

- Miss Adams. Do you think, Sir, you could make your *Ramblers* better ?
Johnson. Certainly I could.
Boswell. I'll lay a bet, Sir, you cannot.
Johnson. But I will, Sir, if I choose. I shall make the best of them
you shall pick out, better.
Boswell. But you may add to them. I will not allow of that.
Johnson. Nay, Sir, there are three ways of making them better ;
—putting out,—adding,—or correcting.³

was originally a misreading of "illustration." Though we cannot know who was responsible for the correction, it is hardly likely that the printer made it. The second new reading is in No. 120, toward the end of the penultimate paragraph : "The guests . . . stole *imperceptible* away," is found in all editions before the ninth, where the italicized word became "imperceptibly." This is a change which any printer might make. Since these appear to be isolated examples, the ninth edition is of small importance.

¹ Though Courtney lists a third edition of the *Rambler* in 1756 (see *Bibliography of Johnson*, p. 33), no such edition is known to exist. Dr. R. W. Chapman discussed the problem in the *Review of English Studies*, III. 77-9. Dr. Allen T. Hazen has discovered advertisements in the *London Evening Post* which indicate that an eight-volume edition of the *Rambler* was offered in 1754, and later in 1756 along with the new fourth edition. Though the edition described in the advertisements may be the lost third, it is more likely that Elphinston's eight-volume Edinburgh edition was being remaindered.

² The page references in this section apply to any of the 8vo editions of Johnson's works prefaced by the essay on his life and genius by Arthur Murphy, but particularly to the edition of 1796. In giving quotations the capitalization of nouns (peculiar to the folio) has not been retained.

³ Boswell, J., *Life of Johnson*, eds. Hill-Powell, Oxford, 1934, IV. 309.

Though Johnson seldom changed the thought of what he had said in the *Rambler*, he did a great deal of "putting out,—adding,—or correcting." These changes in the text are not found uniformly scattered through the 208 numbers, for Johnson had much greater difficulty with some types of papers than he had with other kinds. The stories and allegories were none of them heavily revised; and of the critical papers only numbers 156 and 158 were carefully worked over. The sixty-five letters from imaginary correspondents were for the most part left nearly as they were composed, though numbers 132, 141, 153, 184, 185, and 203 were considerably revised and number 155 is among the *Ramblers* most altered. When going over the essays on general topics and on the various phases of the life of an author, Johnson sometimes revised extensively and sometimes did not,¹ though in general these papers were more heavily corrected than were those previously discussed. It was the essays giving moral advice that caused Johnson most trouble, for the majority of these were greatly changed and elaborated. Johnson occasionally made excisions which indicate a desire to shorten some of the longer papers; at any rate, the *Rambler* as we have it to-day is somewhat shorter than it was originally. It should be added that those *Ramblers* not by Johnson (numbers 30, 44, 97, and 100) and those only partially by him (numbers 10, 15, and 107) were left very nearly as they were originally published. An exception to this statement is the considerable passage omitted from Richardson's paper, number 97. The reason for this omission will be seen as soon as the passage is quoted. Richardson has been describing the immodest conduct of females at watering places such as Tunbridge Wells, Bath, and Scarborough: their actions are such that:

The young fellows buzz about them as flies about a carcase, and they hear with greediness foolish things which they think pretty. They believe the men in earnest; and the men, to gratify the pride and conceit which are raised by such easy conquests, ridicule them for their credulity. (Folio, p. 579.)²

¹ Twenty-six papers little revised; 36 considerably revised; 3 about average.

² Mrs. Elizabeth Carter was the author of *Ramblers* 44 and 100, which were reprinted by her in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1762, pp. 91-104). Her text of the papers is not identical with that used by Johnson in the *Rambler*. It is, unfortunately, impossible to be certain that Mrs. Carter's text as here printed was that which she originally sent to Johnson, or that departures from it in the folio *Rambler* show us Johnson's changes in his correspondent's manuscript. It is, however, highly probable that Mrs. Carter published what she had originally written. Mrs. Carter was displeased with Johnson's changes in *Rambler* 100. (See her letter to Miss Talbot, March 4, 1751; *Carter-Talbot Letters*, ed. Montagu

These, then, are the general characteristics of Johnson's revision : his alterations were usually verbal, seldom did he change an idea ; he reworked most carefully those papers treating moral problems, and was scrupulous against offending good taste. In turning now to specific examples of the kind of changes made, we cannot do better than follow the scheme which Johnson himself suggested, and notice first what Johnson put out of the *Rambler*. In revising, Johnson omitted many banal phrases and interjections which form the small change of written discourse and add little or nothing to the meaning :

- IV, 3. has, *I think*, omitted] has omitted
 V, 33. reproach is *at least* diminished] reproach is diminished
 VI, 30. one may *justly* claim] one may claim

These changes are petty, but when hundreds of words of this type are omitted for every new one added, the text is considerably lightened.

We notice, secondly, that Johnson omitted a considerable number of adjectives during his revision : *inextricable* perplexity] perplexity (IV. 1) ; *contemptuous* disregard of those *salutary* counsels] disregard of counsels (IV. 320) ; owed . . . the *shining* images and *elevated* sentiments] owed . . . the images and sentiments (VI. 26). Had Johnson done this but occasionally, it would have made little difference, but by doing it often he has to some extent removed the stilted effect of many nouns so carefully modified.

The third method of revision is of greater importance. Johnson,

Pennington, London, 1809, II. 14-5.) In No. 44 Johnson makes some 32 verbal alterations, usually of a trifling nature ; and omits a lengthy passage from paragraph 7, probably because it is tautological. In No. 100 there were some 30 small changes in addition to the one which roused Mrs. Carter's ire : namely, a passage in paragraph 7 where Mrs. Carter had spoken of "antiquated notions of duty . . . derived almost wholly from the writings of authors *called, I think, Peter and Paul*, who lived, etc." Johnson omitted the reference to Peter and Paul. Mrs. Carter, who was very precise, and who had purposely assumed a levity not natural to her in order that she might enliven the pages of the *Rambler*, felt this as something of a rebuke. (The passage quoted was not restored to the text by Mrs. Carter, but by her literary executor, Montagu Pennington. See his *Memoirs of the Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Carter*, London, 1807, p. 458.)

¹ In the illustrative passages in this section, those passages italicized are the ones which Johnson omitted, and which will not therefore be found in the *Rambler* as we know it. In those illustrations where much has been deleted, the form given usually represents the text of the first collected edition (1752) as revised for the fourth edition (1756) ; it has not always been possible in illustration to show all the stages of revision, so what has seemed the more important have had to be selected.

like Shakespeare, often expresses himself in parallel fashion; he tends to repeat his idea in slightly different phraseology. During the revision made for the fourth edition, Johnson omitted a great many such passages. Sometimes the revision is only the omission of a word:

IV, 35. the *hydrophobia*, or dread of water] the dread of water

V, 267. thoughts . . . are dissipated or *enfeebled*] thoughts . . . are dissipated

But phrases too are often omitted:

IV, 15. which must be made at such an expense of time and thought, and by such slow degrees

V, 20. produces such a quick sensibility, such an alarming apprehension

Clauses which repeat the thought in a slightly different way are also deleted:

IV, 47. makes Caesar relate of himself, *that his wars never hindered celestial observations*, and that he noted the revolutions of the stars in the midst of preparations for battle.

V, 406. some want leisure, and some resolution, *some are drawn off from the search by business or amusements, and some retire at the appearance of difficulty.*

These quotations illustrate one of Johnson's favourite methods of revision, and represent many textual changes of importance. Changes such as these indicate that when Johnson revised the *Rambler* he desired to make his syntax less involved and difficult.

There remains a great mass of deletions which further illustrate the point made above, namely, that by 1754 Johnson desired to simplify the structure of his sentences. Periodic or balanced sentences are simplified by the omission of phrases or clauses. It is especially noticeable that Johnson tired of sentences containing triplets, that is, three members of similar construction,¹ such as this elaborate prepositional phrase:

IV, 4. complaints of the *partiality of the world*, the severity of the age, and the caprices of criticism.

¹ This characteristic of Johnson's style was commented on by Horace Walpole. (*Letters*, ed. Toynbee, Oxford, 1904, x. 372. H.W. to the Countess of Upper Ossory, Feb. 1, 1779): "I have been saying this morning, that the latter [i.e. Johnson] deals so much in triple tautology, or the fault of repeating the same sense in three different phrases, that I believe it would be possible, taking the groundwork for all three, to make one of his *Ramblers* into three different papers, that should all have exactly the same purport and meaning, but in different phrases."

Johnson used many such constructions in 1750, as further examples will testify :

- IV, 7. he may, by attending the remarks which every paper will produce, *inform himself of his mistakes*, rectify his opinions, and extend his views.
 322. can neither be defended, *palliated* nor concealed.

It appears also that Johnson tired of exactly balanced sentences ; for instance, in this sentence he breaks up the pairing of the adjectives :

- IV, 124. through the *rough and* thorny mazes of science, as the *smooth and* flowery paths of politer literature

and in this the pairing of the infinitives :

- IV, 319. to *admire and* commend the virtues, as well as to expose *and* censure the faults of their contemporaries

Johnson also recast and simplified his sentence structure by omitting unnecessary and redundant elements. This was, indeed, his favourite method of revision, and from many illustrations of this practice these are chosen because they show either elaborate or significant revision :

- IV, 295. *and* While I am thus employed, some of those tedious hours, which I have condemned myself to pass in this place, will slip away, [and]¹ when I return to my usual amusement of watching the clock, I shall find that I have disburdened myself of part of the day, *and that the time of my return from exile is less remote.*
 V, 7. and therefore they have endeavoured only to exhibit *and* inculcate the *severer, more difficult, and* more awful virtues, without condescending to regard those petty *affectations or* secondary qualities, which grow important only by their frequency, and which though *they are overlooked by the speculatist* because they produce no single acts of heroism, etc.
 VI, 23. When any man has endeavoured to deserve distinction, *he may be easily convinced how long his claim is likely to remain unacknowledged, by wandering for a few days from one place of resort to another,* he will be surprised to hear himself censured where he could not expect to have been named ; he will find himself *persecuted with* the utmost acrimony of malice by [among]² those whom he never could have offended, *and perhaps may be invited to an association against himself, or appealed to as a witness of his own infamy.*

¹ Added in the fourth edition.

² Added in the fourth edition.

Changes such as these were made very frequently, and the omission of such passages, as the reader can see, greatly simplified the syntax of Johnson's sentences. This simplification is perhaps the most significant discovery in our study of Johnson's revision of the *Rambler*.

2

Johnson's additions to the text of the *Rambler*, in comparison with the amount of material omitted, are few. Additions were made in a considerable number of places, usually to clarify or particularize what had been said in earlier editions, only occasionally to change the thought. For example, Johnson, in his discussion of Milton's placing of the *cæsura* (*Rambler* 90), adds two illustrations to prove the point he is making, that the pause which concludes a period should fall upon an accented syllable.¹ Here are several passages which illustrate Johnson's endeavour to clarify his meaning²:

- IV, 440. The past is very soon exhausted, *all the events or actions of which the memory can afford pleasure are quickly recollected* ;
 V, 346. and seem to have thought nothing necessary to dignity and seriousness, but that they should crowd the scene with monarchs] they seem to have thought, *that as the meanness of personages constituted comedy, their greatness was sufficient to form a tragedy ; and that nothing was necessary but that they should crowd the scene with monarchs.*

In a few places Johnson found it necessary to make additions which extend the thought of the passage altered, as in this sentence from number 41 :

- IV, 265. To give an accurate answer to the question, of which the terms are not completely understood, is impossible ; *we do not know in what either reason or instinct consist, and therefore cannot tell with exactness how they differ ;*

During revision Johnson, departing from his usual practice, occasionally added adjectives. Thus in number 47 (iv. 302), instinct] *unerring* instinct ; in number 101, (v. 190) sprightliness of fancy] *extemporaneous* sprightliness of fancy ; and in number 143, (vi. 16) miseries] *incurable* miseries.

¹ v. 119.

² In the following quotations those passages are italicized which were added to the text after the original edition, which will, accordingly, be found in the revised *Rambler*.

Johnson added to the *Rambler* in these ways; and though the changes do not bulk large in the total number of new readings, the additions are usually important.

3

In correcting the *Rambler* Johnson first rectified the errors in the folio sheets; these include misprints, faulty readings, and grammatical lapses. Though many corrections had been made in the Edinburgh edition, there still remained much to be done. The text of the mottoes was revised and a number of new ones introduced.¹ It is, of course, impossible to determine whether the original error in the folio is a misreading by the compositor or a mistake made by Johnson; it seems likely, however, that Johnson was responsible for mistakes such as that in number 136 (folio, p. 813), where a pronoun is without an antecedent. There are other grammatical lapses, as when Johnson writes this sentence:

Scarce any can hear with impartiality a comparison between the authors of his own and another country; and though it cannot, I think, be charged equally on all nations, that they are blinded with this literary patriotism, yet there is none that do not look upon its own authors with particular regard, etc. (No. 93, folio, pp. 553-54.)

There are likewise slips of the pen, as in number 132 (folio, p. 787), when Eumathes is made to say, on receiving his *first* patronage, that he is "again perplexed with variety of offers." We should naturally expect that errors of this kind would be found in a periodical, and accordingly their correction is of little interest. It does speak well for the thoroughness of Johnson's revision that he caught most of them in the first collected edition.

Johnson, in his search for the word that would exactly express his meaning, made many verbal changes in the *Rambler*. For example, he came to dislike the word "trivial," and changed it for a more exact one in nearly every place he had used it. It becomes "petty" (iv. 91), "trifling" (iv. 254), "minute" (v. 57), "degenerate" (v. 88), "slender" (vi. 7), "vain" (vi. 34), "slight" (vi. 216), and "silly" (vi. 295). Perhaps these changes were made because Johnson in his *Dictionary* decided that "Trivial" means

¹ Changes or corrections were made in the mottoes of numbers 3, 18, 45, 50, 54, 59, 83, 86, 93, 94, 110, 112, 117, 129, 145, 163, 177, 183, 194, 199, 200, 201, 202, and 208.

properly "Vile; worthless; vulgar; such as may be picked up in the highway," rather than "Light; trifling; unimportant; inconsiderable," in which sense he had used it in the examples quoted above. Other verbal corrections illustrate Johnson's desire for the right word:

IV, 22. *improper* combination of images] *incongruous* combination

336. men's *miseries*] men's *infelicity*

V, 120. full and *complete* close] full and *solemn* close

It is not certain that Johnson always found the right word, though many of his changes are certainly for the better; there is, however, a capriciousness about his verbal correction which may be made clearer.

Johnson was early attacked for his use of hard words in the *Rambler*; did these criticisms cause him to alter his style and to replace hard words by simpler words of similar meaning? This is not easily answered, for though Johnson did change to simpler words in some places, he more often replaced a simple word or phrase by one more elegant or difficult.¹ In these instances, simpler words were introduced:

IV, 67. veracity] truth

200. subject to death] mortal

V, 232. complicated want] nakedness and hunger

but at the same time (sometimes even in the same essay), there are changes of the other kind:

IV, 68. thought] consciousness

V, 353. fancied distresses] supernumerary distresses

VI, 373. a dream] visionary miseries

It is, accordingly, impossible to say that Johnson wished to reform his style in this particular, for the evidence is not conclusive. Johnson sometimes replaces a word by one of its synonyms:

IV, 316. censure] reproach

V, 144. gaiety] jollity

These illustrations lead to a conclusion that Johnson's verbal changes were made at random, and that they did little to improve the *Rambler*.

¹ I have collected 40 good examples of changes from hard words to simpler, and 50 of changes from simple to harder.

There is, however, a small group of corrections which Johnson made either to increase the elegance of his expressions or to change what he had said in earlier editions. In *Rambler* 12, for example, Zosima comes to town to take service. One of her prospective employers, displeased at the fineness of her dress, orders her to be off, and at the same time advises her that "the taverns will be open at night"; Johnson deleted the last two words in revision, possibly to make the lady's recommendation that Zosima become a prostitute less pointed. We come, finally to the single change which Johnson made in the text of the *Rambler* that radically alters the sense: it is to be found in number 88, where Johnson discusses Milton's practice of eliding his vowels. The folio version is:

This licence [*i.e.* the elision of vowels], though an innovation in *English* poetry, is yet allowed in many other languages ancient and modern, and therefore the critics on *Paradise Lost* have, without much deliberation, commended Milton for introducing it.

This becomes:

This licence, though now diffused in *English* poetry, was practiced by our old writers, and is allowed in many other languages ancient and modern, and therefore the critics on *Paradise Lost* have, without much deliberation, commended Milton for continuing it.

IV

We have studied Johnson's alterations in some detail. Has the *Rambler* been improved by these many changes or has it only been radically altered? It is certain that the essays have been greatly improved, for Johnson's omissions and additions have done much either to compress or simplify when that was possible or to expand when expansion was necessary. Johnson's corrections, though arbitrarily made and less decisive in their results, are many of them necessary and some of them excellent. After observing him at work we can only conclude that Johnson was not boasting when he promised Boswell to improve any *Rambler* that he, Boswell, should select. He was not boasting, for he had already improved nearly every one of them.

An important result of this study is its confirmation of Dr. R. W. Chapman's conclusions concerning Johnson's method of revision as he states them in the introduction to his edition of *Rasselas, the Prince of Abissinia*. Though Johnson approached the task of revision

without enthusiasm, he did revise, and that thoroughly. The common impression is that Johnson was a hasty writer, and therefore it is salutary to have it brought to our attention that the man who wrote so hastily was later careful to delete, elaborate, and correct.

But the negative results of this study also deserve special comment. It is surely rather astonishing that Johnson in making two careful revisions of the *Rambler* changed his ideas so little. In the pages of these essays Johnson expressed his views on many of the basic moral problems that confront human beings. He wrote in the prime of life. Surely the fact that he found so few occasions for change is of critical value, because it indicates something about the nature of his thinking. There is every indication that the *Rambler* is the product of a man whose views concerning life are fixed, almost rigidly fixed. We see here, do we not, an early indication of that inflexibility of opinion, apart from matters of fact, that made Johnson a drawing-room tyrant in his old age? This is not to deny the wisdom of much of the *Rambler*, for which I have the highest admiration. In its pages will be found a moral earnestness which has seldom been surpassed, and the record of a penetrating insight into human character. This is true; but the fact remains that even so technical a study as this leads the investigator inevitably to the conclusion that there were limitations to Johnson's thinking, to the growth of his personality.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

JONSON'S SANGUINE RIVAL

JONSON'S *Epistle xii* in the *Forrest*, written as a New Year's gift to Elizabeth Countess of Rutland, contains the following lines to the Countess of Rutland's friend and second cousin, Lucy Countess of Bedford :

You, and that other starre, that purest light,
Of all LUCINA's traine ; LUCY the bright.
Then which, a nobler heaven it selfe knowes not.
Who, though shee have a better verser got,
(Or *Poet*, in the court account) then I,
And, who doth me (though I not him) envy,
Yet, for the timely favours shee hath done,
To my lesse sanguine *Muse*, wherein she' hath wonne
My gratefull soule, the subject of her powers,
I have already us'd some happy houres,
To her remembrance ; which when time shall bring
To curious light, to notes, I then shall sing,
Will prove old ORPHEUS act no tale to be ;¹

The *Epistle* must have been written between 1599, when Elizabeth Sidney married Roger Manners, fifth Earl of Rutland, and 1616, when it was first published. Closer dating turns upon the identity of the Poet, whom editors have called Samuel Daniel,² whereas an identification with Michael Drayton seems closer to the evidence and also fixes the date of the *Epistle* near to 1601.

The case for Daniel is based on three points :

1. In the *Conversations* Drummond reports Jonson as saying :
" Daniel was at Jealousies with him." ³
2. Daniel's *major opus*, on a sanguinary subject, was the *Civil Wars*, issued in fragments, beginning in 1595.
3. Daniel had certain connections with Lady Bedford. About 1599 he became tutor to Anne Clifford, cousin of the Earl of Bedford.⁴

¹ *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. Bernard H. Newdigate, Oxford, 1936, p. 73 et seq.

² *Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. Peter Whalley, London, 1756, vi. 326 n. *Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. W. Gifford, Esq., London, 1816, viii. 278 n. *Poetical Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. H. E. Scudder, Boston, 1879, p. 119 n. *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, Oxford, 1925, i. 159.

³ *Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, i. 136.

⁴ D.N.B.

About 1603 he wrote to Lady Bedford the verse epistle containing the apostrophe to books which called forth Hartley Coleridge's well-known annotation: "Annex these lines as a note and modest answer to the lines in Milton's 'Paradise Regained' in Christ's reply."¹ In 1603, possibly at the suggestion of the Cliffords or possibly as a reward for this epistle, Lady Bedford's family hired Daniel to write the *Panegyrike Congratulatorie* with which they welcomed King James at their manor of Exton on his progress from Scotland. In 1604, as he testifies in the dedication to her of his *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, Daniel was chosen to write that court masque through Lady Bedford's influence. She may also have secured for him the post of Licenser for the Children of the Queen's Revels (1604) and the job of writing his other court masque, *Tethys Festival* (1610).

This is the extent of Daniel's connection with Lady Bedford. From 1595 to 1603 he devoted his muse to other families. There is nothing to connect Lady Bedford with the *Civil Wars*, which was written with the encouragement of Charles Blount Lord Mountjoy and dedicated in its complete form (1609) to Mary Countess of Pembroke. Therefore if Daniel is the Poet, Jonson must have written his *Epistle* after 1603, the earliest possible date at which he could consider Daniel under the protection of Lady Bedford.

The counter arguments in favour of Drayton can be briefly stated:

1. Jonson was more violently at loggerheads with Drayton than with Daniel. In the *Conversations* a reference to Drayton, "Drayton feared him, and he esteemed not of him,"² exactly echoes the relationship between the two poets of the *Epistle*.

2. As for the "sanguine muse," the *Civil Wars* were insufficiently sanguinary for Jonson, who charged that "Daniel wrotht civill warres & yet hath not one batle in all his Book."³ His derisive⁴ comment upon Drayton's *Barons Wars* (a recasting of *Mortimeriados*) was:

I heard that Rore,
And Rouze, the Marching of a mighty force,
Drums against Drums, the neighing of the Horse,
The Flights, the Cryes, and wondering at the Jarres
I saw, and read, it was thy *Barons Warres*!⁵

¹ *Essays and Marginalia*, II. 14.

² *Op. cit.*, I. 136.

³ *Op. cit.*, I. 138.

⁴ For this reading, see J. W. Hebel, *Drayton's "Sirena"* in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. xxxix, No. 4, pp. 830, 831.

⁵ *The Vision of Ben Jonson, on the Muses of his Friend M. Drayton, Poems*, p. 245 et seq.

3. Between 1594 and 1597 Drayton dedicated *Matilda, Endimion and Phœbe, Mortimeriados, The Tragical Legend of Robert, Duke of Normandy*, and *Englands Heroicall Epistles* to Lady Bedford, "my hope, my lady, and my Muse"¹ to which she responded with "sweet golden showers."² Although he wrote no non-dramatic poems between 1597 and 1603, his works were frequently reissued, in most instances continuing their dedications to Lady Bedford. In 1603 he began to dedicate his writings to a new patron, Sir Walter Aston. Drayton was thus the only writer who could be called Lady Bedford's "Poet" in the period of 1594 to 1603, during which period, as we shall see, the *Epistle* must almost certainly have been written.

4. The reference to Lady Bedford as a star in the train of Lucina [Elizabeth] clearly dates the poem before the accession of James, in whose court Lady Bedford from the first enjoyed an eminence far greater than her place with Elizabeth; in the period of the greater glory, Jonson would hardly have recalled the lesser. Elsewhere, in a poem he sent to her with a copy of *Cynthias Revells* (1601),³ Jonson applied to Lady Bedford a similar expression, "Cynthias fayrest Nymph."

Earlier lines in the *Epistle* :

But let this drosse [gold] carry what price it will
With noble ignorants, and let them still
Turne, upon scorned verse, their quarter-face ;

may refer to the relatively cool reception of *Cynthias Revells* by the court, which, following hard upon the attacks of Marston, was a sore disappointment to Jonson. The Orphean songs which Jonson mentions may mean various undated poems to Lady Bedford in the same volume or his contributions to *Loves Martyr* (1601), a group of poems celebrating the qualities of a Phœnix, for whose identity with Lady Bedford Mr. B. H. Newdigate has recently made a case.⁴

R. W. SHORT.

¹ Dedication of *Mortimeriados*, *Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. J. William Hebel, Oxford, 1931, I. 307.

² Dedication of *Endimion and Phœbe*, *op. cit.*, I. 126.

³ *The Phœnix and Turtle*, ed. Bernard H. Newdigate, Oxford, 1937, p. xx.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. xv-xxiv.

MATTHEW PRIOR'S

"WELBELOVED AND DEAR COSSEN"

MATTHEW PRIOR left very few references to his relatives, and biographers have found it difficult to discover anything more. Therefore, when in 1901 the Historical Manuscripts Commission brought to light a letter on this obscure subject that had been written in 1730, it was naturally considered an important document.¹ Its early date, the fact that its author was Conyers Place, master of the Dorchester Grammar School, and its use of information furnished by Matthew Prior's cousin Christopher, all seemed to give it authority. Later investigation, however, has tended to refute rather than confirm its evidence. Even Bickley, who accepted most of the statements made by Place, took note that the tavern kept by Arthur Prior, Matthew's uncle, was the Rhenish, not the Rummer.² And Wickham Legg, in his biography, also contradicts Place's assertion that Prior was born "at or by Wimborne."³ The purpose of this paper is further to correct the letter by showing that it is in error regarding Arthur Prior's daughter Katharine, and to present some new material concerning her life and her relations with her cousin Matthew.

Conyers Place wrote that Arthur Prior had "a daughter named Catherine whom her father sent down to this town [Dorchester], where she was a blazing star some time, to secure her virtue from some of his great guests, but it was too late, one Guy of Yorkshire, called then I remember the Great Guy, followed her and attended her here with his coach and six, whence he carried her off. Christopher says he heard that Catherine married first a French Marquis or Count called Beloe or some such name whom I take to be that

¹ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on the MSS. of the Duke of Portland*, vol. vi (London, 1901), pp. 33-4.

² Francis Bickley, *The Life of Matthew Prior* (London, 1914), pp. 9-10. Wickham Legg presents other evidence leading to the same conclusion (L. G. Wickham Legg, *Matthew Prior: a Study of his Public Career and Correspondence*, Cambridge, 1921, pp. 280-1). Further proof can be found in the allegation made by Arthur Prior in 1674 when he obtained a licence for the marriage of his daughter Ann to John Thompson. He there described himself as a vintner of the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, in which the Rhenish Wine Tavern lay, whereas the Rummer was at Charing Cross, in the parish of St. Martin's in the Fields (*Marriage Allegations in the Registry of the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury*, Harleian Society Publications, vol. xxiii, London, 1886, p. 229).

³ Pp. 2-3.

cousin Catherine Harrison mentioned in Mr. Prior's will, if she is an old woman, otherwise it is likely her daughter."

The statement concerning Katharine Prior's parentage is proved by the record of her baptism at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on December 7, 1662.¹ That concerning her marriage, however, can easily be disproved.

Arthur Prior's will, dated September 1685, makes it clear that Katharine was at that time unmarried and in good favour.² Her status was evidently the same in May 1690, when her brother Laurence drew up his will.³ That she remained single until seven months later is indicated by the description of her as a spinster in the record of her marriage on December 4, 1690, to George Villiers.⁴

This was a very respectable marriage, at least on her part, for Villiers was the son of George, the fourth Viscount Grandison.⁵ His profession was the army, and he advanced rapidly from that time on. In 1691 he was a captain in the first regiment of foot guards.⁶ Three years later he was lieutenant-colonel,⁷ and in December 1696 he was commissioned as colonel of the regiment that had belonged to Sir Richard Atkins until his death.⁸ In 1703 he was in command of a regiment of marines on board Sir Cloudisley Shovell's fleet. Late in that year, when he started to return home by way of Italy, his post calash capsized in the river Piava and he was drowned.⁹

For a time the colonel's widow was busy with her duties as his executrix. After that, for about fifteen years, we have no knowledge of her except that at some time during this period she married a Mr. George Harrison.¹⁰

¹ *The Register of St. Margaret's, Westminster, London, 1660-1675*, Harleian Society Publications, vol. LXIV (London, 1935), p. 18. "Catherin Pryer d. to Arthur by Cather."

² Quoted in Legg, pp. 282-4.

³ Quoted in Legg, p. 284.

⁴ *Marriages at St. James's, Duke's Place*, London Parish Registers, vol. II (London, 1900), p. 317. "George Villiers, b., & Katharine Pryor, s., of St. Martin's in ye Feilds."

⁵ Will of George Villiers, dated June 15, 1695; proved November 20, 1703 (Somerset House, Probate Registry). He names his wife Katharine as sole executrix and principal beneficiary, and mentions her mother, Mrs. Prior.

⁶ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*, May 1690-Oct. 1691 (London, 1898), p. 444.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 1694-1695 (London, 1906), p. 131.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1696 (London, 1913), p. 455.

⁹ Narcissus Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs* (Oxford, 1857), v, 358.

¹⁰ No record of the celebration of this marriage has been found, but the latest date at which it could have occurred is set by the appearance of the names "George Harrison, Esq., Mrs. Katharine Harrison" in the list of subscribers to Prior's 1718 folio of *Poems on Several Occasions*.

Prior evidently kept in closer contact with his cousin Katharine and her family than with any of his other relatives. Her parents had taken him into their home when he was a boy, and he had grown up in intimate association with their children: Katharine, Laurence, and Ann (who married John Thompson). The father, the son, and the married daughter were all dead by February 1691,¹ soon after Prior's first public employment took him abroad, but he maintained close relations with the survivors. The mother, Mrs. Katharine Prior, served as his banker,² receiving his pay from the Treasury and making disbursements for him until her death in March 1698/99.³ The daughter, Katharine, who was mentioned in her mother's will as the wife of the Honourable Geo. Villiers, Esq.,⁴ then became the only remaining member of the family.

At about this time Prior's work brought him back to England. Regarding his correspondence with his cousin during his absence, we know only that upon one occasion he failed to answer her letter.⁵ On his return, however, he must have revived his intimacy with her, for there is apparently sincere personal grief displayed in parts of his ode on the death of her husband:

On curst Piava's Banks the Goddess stood,
Show'd her dire Warrant to the rising Flood;
When What I long must love, and long must mourn,
With fatal Speed was urging his Return;
In his dear Country to disperse his Care,
And arm himself by Rest for future War;
To chide his anxious Friends officious Fears,
And promise to their Joys his elder Years.
Oh! destin'd Head; and oh! severe Decree;
Nor native Country Thou, nor Friend shalt see;
Nor War hast thou to wage, nor Year to come:
Impending Death is thine, and instant Doom.
Hark! the imperious Goddess is obey'd:
Winds murmur; Snows descend; and Waters spread:
Oh! Kinsman, Friend,—Oh! vain are all the Cries
Of human Voice; strong Destiny replies:
Weep You on Earth; for He shall sleep below:
Thence None return; and thither All must go.⁶

¹ The wills of Arthur and Laurence Prior, quoted together with dates of probate in Legg, pp. 282-4.

² Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, vol. III (Hereford, 1907), pp. 53, 86, 119, 123, 199.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

⁴ Will of Mrs. Katharine Prior, dated July 6, 1695; proved April 4, 1699 (Somerset House, Probate Registry). Katharine Villiers was named executrix.

⁵ *MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, III, 62.

⁶ "An Ode. Inscribed to the Memory of the Honble Col. George Villiers," in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1718), pp. 179-80. The subject of this poem has not heretofore been properly identified.

In addition to honouring Colonel Villiers in these verses, Prior assisted the widow by writing to the English consul at Venice concerning the collection of her husband's effects and the return of the body to England if it should be found.¹

After her marriage to George Harrison, Katharine lived next door to Prior in Duke Street, on part of the land that had been granted to him by exchequer lease in 1701.² The Harrisons also had a place at Kew Green, near Richmond, and there they resided much of the time, Mr. Harrison making the trip into London almost every day.³ Even when they were not his neighbours, Prior visited them, for in 1720, writing to Lord Harley from Kew Green, he said, "You see my dear Lord, by the place whence I date my letter, that I am with my nearest relation, very kindly received."⁴ His intimacy with the family is further attested by the fact that in August 1720, when he wished to conceal some of his South Sea transactions, he was able to subscribe for £500 of stock in Mr. Harrison's name.⁵ Moreover, in 1721, when Prior drew up his will, the only relative he mentioned was Katharine Harrison, whom he called "my welbeloved and dear Cossen," and to whom he left £100 "with which She will please to buy mourning."⁶

The Harrisons were in the country when Prior died, but they were immediately notified by the poet's secretary, Adrian Drift, who together with Edward Lord Harley was executor of his estate.⁷ A few days later Mrs. Harrison answered his letter from Eastham :

Mr: Harrison was Seized with a Violent Fever last Saturday, which has given me the greatest trouble imaginable, and the weak State of health I am in made me hardly able to support my self before I received Your Letter with the Surprising Melancholly account of the Death of my Dear Cousen Prior. The Doctors does assure me Mr Harrison is out of Danger, but he is extremely weak, and I know not when we shal be able to

¹ Prior MSS. at Longleat, XIII, 30-3.

² Welbeck MS., ff. 56, 160^v. The volume thus designated throughout this paper is a collection of the reports and correspondence of Prior's executors. It was formerly No. 10860 in the collection of Sir Thomas Phillipps, but is now in the possession of the Duke of Portland, who has very kindly given permission for its use in the present study and in several others to be published soon.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 180.

⁴ MSS. of the *Marquis of Bath*, III, 487.

⁵ Welbeck MS., f. 52^v. In another paper, now being prepared for publication, I shall discuss Prior's wealth and all his investments, including his speculations in South Sea stock.

⁶ Will of Matthew Prior, dated August 9, 1721; proved September 19, 1721 (Somerset House, Probate Registry).

⁷ Welbeck MS., f. 93^v.

get to London, so that it will be impossible for him to attend my Cousen to his Grave.

I being his nearest Relation desire to have a Copy of his Will, and beg the favor of You to send it me as soon as possible. I am so extremely weak that it is with great difficulty I write this, and will only add that I hope my Cousen and your Friend has made a good Provision for You.¹

Probably Mrs. Harrison was disappointed when she did receive a copy of Prior's will, for the amount left to her was small considering his debt to her family and humiliatingly small in comparison with some of the other legacies. She was discreet enough to conceal her pique for the time being, but her patience was tried by the executors' delay in delivering the £100. In April 1722, having received no money, she took as part payment silverware valued at £16 18s. 8d.² But she refused to accept any more of Prior's goods in lieu of cash,³ and had to wait until October 2, 1722, for the legacy with which she was supposed to buy mourning.⁴

To make matters worse, disappointment and delay were succeeded by insult. While Mrs. Harrison was still waiting for payment, Drift found among his master's papers an account of disbursements that Prior had made for his cousin in 1704.⁵ He sent a copy of this to her with the suggestion that the sum, £6 10s., be deducted from the bequest.⁶ It is not surprising that upon this additional provocation Mrs. Harrison wrote an indignant letter expressing her dissatisfaction with Prior's treatment of her :

I have been much out of Order, or I had Answered Your Letter sooner, I own it was a very great Surprise to me, thō but a very Trifle.

To Answer it particularly, As to the Hatchment I remember Mr: Prior did order an ignorant Fellow to draw one, which was so wrong that Strangers knocked at my door to Ask why such a thing was put up for a Man of Colonel Villiers's Quality and Family, and there is yet in my house a Hatchment that I paid Mr: Filer in St Margarets Church_Yard 5 Pounds for.

As to Twenty Shillings to Dr: Blackmore I know not what it can mean for I never wanted a Fee to give a Dr: when I had occasion for One in my Life.

For the Books I shal say Nothing to them only that I have not nor ever had the History of the Bible.

And, now I must tell You that since You are for going so far back, this thing shal be let alone 'till I am in Town where I believe I shal

¹ Welbeck MS., f. 95^r, K. Harrison to Drift, Eastham, September 24, 1721.

² *Ibid.*, ff. 125, 179.

³ *Ibid.*, f. 179.

⁴ *Ibid.*, f. 86.

⁵ *Ibid.*, f. 54.

⁶ *Ibid.*, f. 125.

produce Acquittances for much larger Sums of Money paid by my Family, to whom I am Executor, for Mr: Prior.

As to my Coss: Priors gratitude and I may say Justice to me at his Death let that rest with him, but I believe you are Sensible he Owed his All to my Family.¹

This letter resolves Conyers Place's doubt as to whether Katharine Harrison was the daughter or granddaughter of Arthur Prior, for its whole viewpoint is that of his daughter, the Cousin Katharine with whom Prior was reared and the widow of Colonel Villiers.²

H. BUNKER WRIGHT.

GARRICK, AND AN UNKNOWN OPERATIC VERSION OF *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*

THE Folger Shakespeare Library possesses, among its other unique Garrick relics, an item of interest never before noted, namely, Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* altered into an opera by Captain Edward Thompson at Garrick's request. The opera was never performed, and Thompson's letter to Garrick concerning it has never been published. The alteration, a cleanly interleaved 1735 Tonson edition of the play, with notes, cuts, and songs, has been out of sight these hundred and fifty years since Garrick's death, along with his alterations of *Hamlet*, *Henry IV, part two*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. For eighty of these years, 1823-1900, these items lay in a box in a London lawyer's office, and for the last thirty in the Brooklyn storehouse of Mr. Henry C. Folger.³ Thompson's letter has lain for untold years unobserved in the Forster Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.

Inasmuch as the alteration was never produced it had no effect upon the audiences of the eighteenth century, but since it has now

¹ Welbeck MS., f. 126^v, Kath: Harrison to Drift, Kew Green, September 5, 1722. Drift of course yielded to this attack and abandoned his claim. Letters of reconciliation passed between him and Mrs. Harrison, and they resumed a rather cautious friendship based on mutual suspicion (*ibid.*, ff. 127, 130^v, 186).

² Any daughter that Katharine Prior might have had by Villiers could not have been more than twelve years old at the time of her father's death; and, with her mother still living and acting as his executor, she would not have been buying a hatchment to put upon *her house*.

³ For an account of the provenance of these plays see my article, "Garrick's Long Lost Alteration of *Hamlet*," *P.M.L.A.*, September 1934.

come to light I shall give a brief account of it, in order that the record of Garrick's handling of Shakespeare's plays may be made complete.

It was late in Garrick's career, apparently, when he asked Captain Thompson to try his hand at turning *Love's Labours Lost* into an opera. Just why he asked this particular man to do it we cannot be sure. Thompson, although he had been in the navy from boyhood, had shown some turn for literature. He wrote satirical poems, and a group of "Sailor's Letters" to his select friends in England during his voyages. It was in 1771 that through the influence of Garrick he was promoted, having been on half pay for a number of years, to the rank of commander, and appointed to the *Kingfisher*, a small vessel employed in the North Sea on preventive service. In 1773 he altered Shadwell's old play *The Fair Quaker of Deal* into *The Fair Quaker : or the Humours of the Navy*, which was produced successfully at Drury Lane Theatre on November 11 of that year¹. It was during the summer preceding this performance, however, that he wrote to Garrick :

... In consequence of your recommendation, I have already altered *Love's Labour's Lost* to an opera—I think so pruned it will do—it is better gutted of it's quaint sayings & puerilities—and as an opera—the rhymes are not offensive. . . .²

He sent his work to Garrick, but the actor's acknowledgment is not extant.

The alteration is doubly interesting because of the closeness with which it adheres to the Shakespearian text. Needless to say, it has nothing to do with *The Students*, the anonymous publication of 1762, which is the only other attempt during the eighteenth century to fit *Love's Labour's Lost* to the stage.³ The opera includes twenty-one songs, yet all of them come from Shakespeare's text either verbatim or in close paraphrase. Thompson intended to add a twenty-third of his own composition, but never got around to making it. His note at the very beginning of Act III reads : "I shall here compose an air for Moth."

A few examples are sufficient to show Thompson's method of

¹ D.N.B. ; Genest v. 398.

² Forster Coll. 48. F. 27, Victoria and Albert Museum.

³ Genest, x. 180 ; Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, i. 373.

devising songs from the original text. His first "Air" comes at i. i. 47, 48, where Shakespeare's lines are as follows :

Biron : . . . O ! these are barren tasks, too hard to keep,
Not to see ladies, study, fast, not sleep.

The "air" runs :

Biron : O these are barren tasks,
Too hard to keep :
Not to see ladies,
Study, fast, nor sleep.

The second "Air" is sung by the king, and proves to be a slight paraphrase, with the addition of two lines, of his characterization of Armado, i. i. 163 ff. :

A man in all the World's new fashions bred,
That hath a mint of phrases in his head ;
One, whom the music of his own vain tongue,
Doth ravish like enchanting harmony,
Deliver'd like an angel fair and young,
Soft mistress of Heav'n's softest minstrelsy.

For his third "Air" Thompson paraphrases Costard's prose—

I suffer for the truth, sir : for true it is I was taken with Jaquenetta, and Jaquenetta is a true girl ; and therefore welcome the sour cup of prosperity ! Affliction may one day smile again ; and till then, sit thee down, sorrow ! " (i. i. 309 ff.)—

as follows :

I suffer for the truth, Sir,
For true it is I was,
With Jaquenetta taken,
A buxom pretty lass :
And if I must sup,
Of sorrow's sweet cup
I'm an ass—let it pass—let it pass."

Armado's final speech in Shakespeare's first act ends with this prayer :

Assist me some extemporal God of rime, for I am sure I shall turn sonnet. Devise wit, write pen, for I am whole volumes in folio.

Thompson answers that prayer, becomes that God, and produces for Armado the fifth "Air" in the opera :

Love makes us each an Apollo-man,
Hercules, Sampson, & Solomon,
Had all been dull and stupid
But for the shaft of Cupid :
O Jaquenetta ;
My lovely pett-a
Won't Cupid tame her
Omnia vincit amor ! ¹

All in all Thompson cut from the original text seven hundred and sixty-five lines. But two hundred and thirty-one of these had already been cut for him by Pope, for the Tonson edition of 1735 is a reprint of Pope's edition of 1728, which excludes lines felt by Pope to be actor's interpolations, or "degradations" unworthy of Shakespeare. Two hundred and thirty-one such lines Pope put into the footnotes of his text, and Tonson followed suit. Thompson excised all of these. His largest single cut, however, was the elimination of the pageant of the Nine Worthies.² His note on the interleaf gives his reason : "I have observed, all plays, played on the stage are heavy—I have therefore struck out this scene." Throughout the remainder of the play he omitted three hundred and thirty-eight other lines. These included, of course, all references to the Nine Worthies, but for the most part were concerned with passages of "quibble" which displeased the eighteenth century ; an excellent example is the following :

Arm. : But O, but O.
Moth : The hobby-horse is forgot.
Arm. : Call'st thou my love a hobby-horse ?
Moth : No master, the hobby horse is but a colt, and your love perhaps a hackney : but have you forgot your love ?
Arm. : Almost I had.
Moth : Negligent student, learn by her heart.
Arm. : By heart, and in heart, boy.
Moth : And out of heart, master : all those three will I prove.
Arm. : What wilt thou prove ?
Moth : A man, if I live (and this) *by*, *in*, and *out of* : upon the instant : *by* heart you love her, because your heart cannot come by her : *in* heart

¹ It will be seen that the burden of this song is Armado's speech.

² Act v, scene ii.

you love her, because your heart is in love with her; and *out of heart* you love her, being out of heart that you cannot enjoy her.

Arm. : I am all these three.

Moth : And three times as much more; and yet no thing at all.

(III. i. 31-52.)¹

Certain emendations of the Tonson text proclaim that Thompson had by him a copy of Theobald's edition, for the alterations square with the Theobald readings: I. i. 62, *fast* becomes *feast*; v. i. 32, *Bome*, *boon for boon prescian* becomes *Bone for bene*—Priscian; v. i. 73, *unum cita* becomes *circum circa*; v. i. 61, *concludes it out* becomes *concludes to o-u*. He also follows Theobald's assignment of speeches to Boyet and Biron in the fifth act, an assignment which differs slightly from Pope's.

In the first scene of Act v, in the discussion as to what sort of an entertainment to perform, Holofernes says to Armado " . . . none so fit as to present the nine worthies." Since this pageant was later to be eliminated Thompson crossed out "nine worthies" and substituted "Hyems and Ver in an Epithalamium." This refers, of course, to the final masque of Winter and Spring (v. ii. 900 ff.). Upon the opposite interleaf is pinned a song of five stanzas, ludicrous enough, but hardly an epithalamium, on the theme of obstinacy in love and the falseness of masculine fidelity.

Thompson notes at the outset: "I have not divided it into three acts—I waited your opinion first—you will find the rhymes in an opera not so offensive as in a comedy²—and in general I have taken the words of Shakespeare for the songs. I intended at first to have omitted the masquerade scene—but found it was not practicable upon a more serious examination."³ At the conclusion of his version appears the following note: "There are only 21 airs—which will be sufficient when the speaking parts are more extensive and witty and sensible than any other opera." His respect for Shakespeare is quite obvious throughout. The altered volume shows no evidence

¹ Also he excised one or two broad lines such as III. i. 194: "King of cod-pieces."

² And yet in several places he emends to get rid of rime: I. i. 176-7 becomes "Armado is a most illustrious *knight*, A man of fire-new words, fashion's own *slave*," a substitution for Shakespeare's, "Armado is a most illustrious *wight*, A man of fire-new words, fashion's own *knight*."

³ And so there appears at v. ii. 126, where the Prince says,

"And will they so? the gallants shall be task't, For, Ladies, we will everyone be mask't . . .", his note "The part marked / omitted (now stands) the masquerade scenes could not be omitted."

that Garrick studied it carefully. The only notation in his hand is on the outside cover: "Love's Labor Lost—Thompson// " Why he never attempted to produce the opera we shall, I suppose, never know. Perhaps he thought the time for musical adaptations of Shakespeare had passed. He knew the temper of his audiences better than any other manager, possibly, that has ever lived, and he must have had some sufficient reason. Of course he may not have approved of Thompson's alteration. However, it is an interesting fact that he once played with the idea of giving his age a play of Shakespeare's that had never had a performance, even in an altered version, since the closing of the theatres in 1642.

GEORGE WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

THE GRAND QUESTION DEBATED

IN the years 1728–30 Swift paid three long visits to his friends Sir Arthur and Lady Acheson at Market Hill (now known as Gosford Castle), near Armagh. During each visit he wrote several poems relating to the place, his host, and hostess.

The best of these pieces, comparable in its colloquial humour to the much earlier *Mrs. Harris's Petition* (1701), appeared simultaneously, January 1731–2, in London and Dublin editions, under differing titles and with differing texts. The London edition, printed as a quarto pamphlet of twenty pages, published by J. Roberts, carried the title *A Soldier and a Scholar: Or the Lady's Judgment Upon these two Characters In the Persons of Captain ——— and D——n S——t*. The Dublin edition, in the form of an octavo pamphlet of twenty pages, containing also another poem, was published by George Faulkner with the title *The Grand Question debated: Whether Hamilton's Bawn Should be turn'd into a Barrack, Or a Malt-House*. There are many verbal differences between the two editions, which were evidently printed from different manuscripts. It is curious, further, that Faulkner, on his title-page, refers to a London edition "printed by A. Moore," and introduces the poem with "*The Preface to the English Edition*." No edition by Moore is known; nor does Roberts's edition include a preface. But that Faulkner had some understanding with an English bookseller seems probable, for Swift, writing to Benjamin Motte, Nov. 4, 1732, alludes to manuscripts handed about and says, "so

copies ran, and Faulkner got them, and I had no property, but Faulkner made them his in London."

A slight but noticeable difference between the London and Dublin editions is that the dialogue of the latter is dialectically more Irish in character. When the poem appeared in the Pope and Swift *Miscellanies* volume of 1732 the English text was followed with changes and corrections. In Faulkner's edition of Swift's *Works*, 1735, the Dublin text was followed with the addition of four lines authorized by Swift himself¹ in a manuscript note in his own copy of the *Miscellanies* of 1732.²

At the recent sale of the William Randolph Hearst collection at the Parke-Bernet Galleries in New York an autograph manuscript of *The grand Question debated* appeared.³ The manuscript occupies eight large octavo pages, and is headed "The grand Question debated, / Whether Hamiltons bawn shall be turned into / a Malt-house or a Barack." The text is very clearly that of Faulkner's 1732 edition, even to brackets and paragraph divisions, but the so-called "Preface to the English Edition" does not appear. Variants from the 1732 text are slight, indicating that the manuscript antedates Faulkner's authoritative revision of 1735. The manuscript does not, however, appear to have been intended for the printer, but as fair copy to pass from hand to hand. Swift, in any event, writing to Pope, June 12, 1732, asserted that publication was from "stolen copy." Furthermore, the manuscript, very legibly written in Swift's larger hand, was obviously copied from another finished manuscript, or possibly even from the Dublin printed edition of 1732. On p. 2 a couplet has been overlooked, and is written in between the lines. On p. 4 four successive lines were omitted and written in later. Sixteen lines which should have appeared on p. 7 were missed. They are added on p. 8 with directions for insertion. The original from which this copy was made was obviously complete in form.

It may be added in conclusion that the text of Swift's manuscript supports that of Faulkner; and, furthermore, the date, 1729, assigned by Mr. Williams, on internal and external evidence, to the composition of the poem is most probably correct.

¹ For a more detailed bibliographical and textual statement see *Swift's Poems*, ed. H. Williams, Oxford, 1937, where the poem is printed from Faulkner's text of 1735.

² Lord Rothschild's Library.

³ Now Lord Rothschild's Library.

Swift has endorsed his covering sheet :

The grand Question
debated.

Sep^r. 2^d 1729.

It is true that on the next leaf, against his title, he has written :

Sep^t. 2^d
1728.

but he was often uncertain about dates, and the endorsement seems to have the better authority. In either year he was at Market Hill in September.

HAROLD WILLIAMS,
ROTHSCHILD.

HARDY AND THE WOODLANDERS

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON was preparing to sail from London on Monday, August 22, 1887. He was leaving England for the last time, and Edmund Gosse was on hand to see him off. "The only book he seemed to wish to carry away with him was Mr. Hardy's beautiful romance, *The Woodlanders*, which we had to scour London that Sunday afternoon to get hold of. In the evening . . . I . . . returned . . . with the three volumes, borrowed or stolen somewhere, and wrapped up for the voyage next day."¹

Stevenson and Gosse were not alone in admiring *The Woodlanders*. The *Saturday Review* had declared (on April 4, 1887) that this novel contained "the best that Hardy has ever written." And before the year was over the author could feel sure that the story was a success. At the end of 1887 he jotted down: "The year has been a fairly friendly one to me. . . . It has . . . enabled me to hold my own in fiction . . . by the completion of *The Woodlanders*."

From that date on, the chorus of praise has been fairly constant. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch recently declared: "*The Woodlanders* is to my thinking his loveliest if not his strongest book."² William Lyon Phelps called it "the most beautiful and most noble of Hardy's novels."³ A. Edward Newton is even more emphatic: "*The*

¹ Gosse, *Critical Kit-Kats*, 1896, p. 298.

² *The Poet as Citizen*, New York, Macmillan, 1935, p. 208.

³ "Thomas Hardy's Fifteen Novels," *The Forum* (79 : 444), March 1928.

Woodlanders is one of the best novels of the last half century." ¹ S. C. Chew calls it "the most tender of all Hardy's books." ² Hardy himself continued to think well of this work and Newman Flower has reported that "*The Woodlanders*, he once told me, was his favourite book." ³ Twenty-five years after its first appearance, Hardy was engaged in a final revision of the text, preparing for the publication of the "Wessex Edition" of his works. On April 12, 1912, he recorded his judgment as follows: "On taking up *The Woodlanders* and reading it after many years, I think I like it *as a story* the best of all. Perhaps that is owing to the locality and scenery of the action, a part I am very fond of. It seems a more quaint and fresh story than the *Native*, and the characters are very distinctly drawn."

The full significance of Hardy's statement has not, I think, been noted. When he emphasized his liking for *The Woodlanders* "as a story," he implied that in some other way or ways he did *not* like it. His dislike could not be of the geographical setting, because that was "a part I am very fond of." What is left is, obviously, the characters. After twenty-five years Hardy felt that they were "very distinctly drawn," but he did *not* say that he liked them.

Ten years ago, when Mrs. Hardy first published the author's statement about *The Woodlanders*, it might have been conjectured that Hardy was not wholly pleased with the characters he had created for the Hintock neighbourhood. But now it need no longer be conjecture; a definite assertion of fact is possible.

On November 7, 1938, a number of Hardy books were sold at auction at Sotheby's, and among them was an autographed copy of *The Woodlanders*. It was once the property of Miss Rebekah Owen and is now in the library of Colby College (Waterville, Maine, U.S.A.). Miss Owen and her sister were New York ladies who went to Dorchester in 1892 and were soon frequent and welcome visitors at Max Gate.⁴ They were the "good judges across the Atlantic" to whom Hardy referred in his 1895 preface to *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, and to whom we owe the restoration of "nearly a chapter"

¹ *The Amenities of Book-Collecting*, Boston, 1924, p. 124.

² *Thomas Hardy, Poet and Novelist*, New York, Knopf, 1928, p. 49.

³ *Sunday Times*, London, Jan. 15, 1928, p. 12.

⁴ For further information about them and their long friendship with Hardy, see *Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy*, Colby College Monograph No. 8, Waterville (Maine), 1939.

at the end of that novel.¹ And to Rebekah Owen we owe the specific statement which removes Hardy's attitude towards the characters in *The Woodlanders* from the field of conjecture.

She and her sister had called on the Hardys at Max Gate on Wednesday, September 13, 1893. After tea they walked over to the former parish of William Barnes. Rebekah Owen recorded their conversation as follows (I copy from her book):

Mr. Hardy and I were walking through Came Park and over Came Down, and speaking of *The Woodlanders*.² He said that Grace never interested him much; he was provoked with her all along. If she would have done a really self-abandoned, impassioned thing (gone off with Giles), he could have made a fine tragic ending to the book, but she was too commonplace and straitlaced, and he could not make her.

I said I thought her less particular than Giles; she was "willin'" when he was not. I spoke of Marty's very beautiful character, and of her being called by many the one truly noble and womanly woman in his novels. He said, "Ah, well! She did not *get* Giles, you see; very likely, if she had, it would have been a different matter." (He never wrote anything more cynical than this.)

He further said that he did not make the end as clear as he should have done and perhaps would do in a revised edition. He found that people (I among them) do not see that he means that Fitzpiers goes on all his life in his bad way, and that in returning to him Grace meets her retribution "for not sticking to Giles." Her father hints at it in one sentence,³ or forebodes it, but the matter is not made manifest.

Since Fitzpiers and Mrs. Charmond, the intruders in this "sequestered spot outside the gates of the world," are drawn unsympathetically, and since the author "was provoked with Grace all along" and even Marty was not sure of happiness in the mind of her author, Giles alone is left among the characters. He is the only one of Hardy's creations to die for love, but even that supreme sacrifice is not enough to make Hardy like him, as, for example, he came to like Clym Yeobright. The result was, he liked *The Woodlanders* "as a story"; he liked the plot and the setting, but not the people in it.

There is another note in Miss Owen's book which is worth

¹ See "The Restoration of Hardy's Starved Goldfinch," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* (Vol. 55), New York, 1940.

² Miss Owen had read this novel for the first time in New York at the time of its initial publication in 1887, and had read it a second time in 1891, shortly before leaving New York. She read it yet again at Dorchester in 1892, and thus had prepared herself for an intelligent discussion of the novel with the author.

³ "It's a forlorn hope" (Chapter 48).

quoting. In Chapter 8 occurs the following passage (Mrs. Charmond is speaking) :

I am often impelled to record my impressions. . . . But I cannot find energy enough to do it. . . . I feel a crowd of ideas and fancies thronging upon me continually ; but to unfold writing materials, take up a cold steel pen, and put these impressions down systematically on cold smooth paper—that I cannot do.

Miss Owen's marginal annotation of this passage is : " Exactly E.L.H."—*i.e.* Emma Lavinia Hardy. Apparently the author had transferred to Mrs. Charmond this characteristic of his first wife—one that was sufficiently prominent for her American friends to recognize, in this one respect, Mrs. Charmond's original.

Rebekah Owen's book was a copy of the 1889 reprint of the second edition in one volume. The author autographed it : " Yours faithfully, Thomas Hardy."

CARL J. WEBER.

AN ANALOGUE OF THE CÆDMON STORY

HENRY BRADLEY in his remarks on the famous account by Bede of Cædmon the neatherd, who received in a dream a divine gift of poetry, mentions that " similar traditions are found in the literatures of many different nations and periods."¹ Miss Nellie S. Aurner in her citation of one interesting parallel to Bede's story² refers to the desirability of collecting these analogues. Further references are added towards this end in a note by Professor Fr. Klaeber,³ and the whole ground of the Cædmon incident is well surveyed (and its authenticity vindicated) by Miss Louise Pound in her paper " Cædmon's Dream Song," which appeared in 1929.⁴

The stray analogue cited here is remote in time and place, but perhaps close enough in details to interest scholars of Old English. It is from the great Indian epic *Ramayana*, the oldest of the Sanskrit epics, of an undoubted but highly controversial antiquity. The *Ramayana* or parts of it is attributed traditionally to the great sage Valmiki, and the opening passages of the epic as it now exists deal with the bestowal of divine poetic inspiration to Valmiki. It is this which furnishes a remarkable parallel to Bede's story of Cædmon.

¹ *The Dictionary of National Biography*, VIII (1886), s.n. " Cædmon."

² " Bede and Pausanias," *MLN.*, XLI (1926), p. 535 f.

³ " Analogues of the Story of Cædmon," *MLN.*, XLII (1927), p. 390.

⁴ *Studies in Philology, a Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, University of Minnesota, pp. 232-9. Mr. L. W. Chappell, " The Cædmon Story," *Englische Studien*, LXIX (1934), pp. 152-4, has added a (somewhat remote) Celtic analogue.

In the structure of the *Ramayana* the details of Valmiki's inspiration are preliminary matter, probably later additions to its main subject, the stories of the hero Rama. They occupy chapter or canto (*sarga*) 1 and 2 of the *Badakanda*, the first *kanda* or book of the epic. A brief summary of this part, interspersed with literal renderings of the Sanskrit, may be given.¹

Valmiki's story is told as of a time long past. He was an ascetic, a devout and learned Brahmin who having spent many years in the active world withdrew in characteristic style to live with his disciples in contemplation, and dwelt in a solitary hermitage among the woods. There one morning he is visited by the Divine Sage Narada (the messenger of the gods), who discusses with him how man shall be ennobled; it is, says Narada, by poetry, by the telling in verse of the exemplary life of Rama, a great hero of the past. Narada then departs. Meditating on the matter Valmiki goes for the customary midday bathe in the waters of Tamasa. There come a pair of Krauñcha birds² disporting themselves; as he watches with pleasure a hunter shoots down the cock-bird, and made indignant at the lamenting of the female, Valmiki pronounces a curse on the archer. Later as he ponders on the words he had spoken he finds they are in a metrical pattern (a *s'loka*): "Let my words, which have proceeded out of distress, stand as a verse and not otherwise. (For) they are bound by feet containing an equal number of syllables and capable of being set to music in harmony with time."³

He returns to his hermitage and is soon surprised by a divine vision. "At this juncture, the four-faced and resplendent Brahma, the creator and overlord of the universe came to see the best of sages (Valmiki)."⁴ After the astonished sage has made his reverences, he talks with the god and chances to repeat the verse (the *Manishada*) he had sung forth before bathing; the god tells Valmiki it is a true

¹ For these an old schoolbook has been used, M. C. Sandagopachariar, *Valmiki*, Bombay (University of Madras), 1889; the translation in this is severely literal and thus of value for the present purpose. Also more accessible English translations may be noted. The standard one is by Manmatha Nath Dutt, *The Ramayana translated into English Prose*, vol. 1, Calcutta, 1892, a good close version; there is also C. R. Sreenivasa Ayyangar, *The Ramayana of Valmiki rendered into English*, Pt. I, Madras, 1910, an enthusiastic piece of work with more florid translation. A good volume of extracts is to be found by Frederika Macdonald, *The Iliad of the East*, 2nd ed., London, 1908 (our part is Chapter I: 'How Valmiki Received the Gift of Poesy'), based on the older French translation of the complete epic by Hippolyte Fauche, *Ramayana, Poème Sanscrit mis en François*, revised ed. 1864.

² In the translations variously given as curlews or herons.

³ *Sarga* 2, *S'loka* 21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, *S'loka* 26.

s'loka, and declares: "Oh Brahmana, this has spontaneously proceeded out of you. Oh great sage, write the whole of the history of Rama. . . .¹ "So saying, the venerable Brahma vanished from thence. Valmiki and his pupils were greatly astonished. "Then all his pupils sang this verse again and again, and repeatedly talked about it, joyous and astonished. "What was uttered by the great sage in four feet of an equal number of syllables, having proceeded from his compassion, is only his pity (for the bird) which took the form of a *S'loka*."² By this chance it came about that Valmiki gained the power of writing his *Ramayana* in verses of such a metre.

This account of Valmiki is a picturesque legend which has several obvious similarities to Bede's story of Cædmon. Most striking is the divine appearance and the sudden acquisition of the divine gift of poetry. Bede's story is of course too well known to need citing here. Naturally this Indian analogue differs in many details: in particular the gift does not come to Valmiki in an actual dream, as Cædmon's did, and the divine appearance is twofold, both before and after Valmiki realizes his gift. Valmiki's story is an interesting parallel, to which no theory other than "independent origins" could possibly apply.³

L. WHITBREAD.

THE INTERPRETATION OF *PARADISE LOST*, BOOK VII, ll. 168 ff.

PROFESSOR SAURAT⁴ rightly pointed out the error in my punctuation of this passage. I used Masson's punctuation and this was certainly not Milton's. The punctuation, however, does not affect my point, as I show in my book, *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine*, recently published (Oxford University Press, 1939). In that work, also, I make a study of the manuscript of *De Doctrina Christiana*, which seems to show that we must hold that Milton did indeed "contradict himself," unless we agree to look for the "chronological" relationship between the treatise and *Paradise Lost*, as well as the "psychological and artistic."

W. A. SEWELL.

¹ Sarga 2, *S'loka* 34.

² *Ibid.*, *S'loka* 41-43.

³ Mention might be made here of a courageous attempt to relate the epic qualities of the *Ramayana* to those of the Old English *Beowulf*, by I. S. Peter, *Beowulf and the Rāmāyana: a Study in Epic Poetry*, London, 1934. Since Dr. Peter's monograph was not extensively reviewed, I may refer to it as a careful and interesting exposition of the parallel heroic conditions in the Old English and the Indian epics; the *Ramayana* itself and some of the theories as to its date, are conveniently discussed in it, pp. 12 ff.

⁴ *R.E.S.*, No. 57 (Jan. 1939), p. 73 sqq.

REVIEWS

The Liber de Diversis Medicinis. Edited by MARGARET S. OGDEN. (E.E.T.S. Original Series, No. 207.) 1938 (for 1936). Oxford University Press. 10s. net.

DR. OGDEN's edition of the *Liber de Diversis Medicinis* provides a reliable text of an interesting medical tract. What is more important for the Middle English scholar, it makes accessible yet another section of the Thornton Manuscript, and brings one step nearer the very desirable possession of a complete collection in print of all the literature of fourteenth and fifteenth century Yorkshire. The text is not likely to contribute much to the knowledge of mediæval medicine, as most of its recipes are found elsewhere, but the general cultural interest of the *Liber*, the light it throws on a certain side of fifteenth century life, ought not to be overlooked. There is the usual mixture of genuine therapeutic lore and humbug, and the humbug has its own peculiar interest. One wonders what success Robert Thornton had with the recipe "For to gare a woman say what þu askes hir," and whether the repeated assurances of the efficacy of this or that treatment were founded on experience or tradition. Dr. Ogden has collected the parallels with commendable thoroughness, and the discovery of still more may clear up a few points.¹ It would have been both interesting and profitable to investigate some of the Celtic material; there are Welsh texts which clearly derive from English and not Latin sources,² and such an investigation might elucidate some textual difficulties.

The conclusions of the editor concerning the identity of the scribe of the manuscript with Robert Thornton of East Newton confirm what was already believed: the alternative candidate, Robert Thornton, archdeacon of Bedford (d. 1450) can hardly be taken seriously. The language of the *Liber* is clearly northern,

¹ E.g. the meaning of *græue*, 42/7. *Aristotill*, 58/6, looks like a corruption of *aristoloche*, "birth-wort." A parallel would perhaps throw light on this. The herb is frequently referred to in Welsh medical tracts under the name *hemlydan*, v. P. Diverres, *Meddygon Myddoeu*, 1913, p. 200.

² E.g. *A Welsh Leech Book*, ed. Timothy Lewis, 1914. It is possible that Welsh recipes taken from sources no longer extant would furnish a few parallels not obtainable elsewhere.

though with this matter of language the editor has chosen to deal rather cursorily. One important point is that though the text seems to have been taken, in one way or another, from various sources, the language is to all intents and purposes uniform¹; nor do the side-notes show any special peculiarities.² If, as it appears, the text represents fairly accurately Thornton's own dialect, we have in the *Liber* a useful control in considering other texts in the MS. which are certainly transcripts.³ One could have wished for more information and conclusions about the language—for example, some observations on the treatment of OE. *ī* and *ū* in open syllables. The statement on p. xxvii, "There are also frequent *gh*-spellings for OE. *ȝ*, indicating that the guttural consonant probably was strongly pronounced," is misleading, as likewise to call spellings like *swalowe*, *zalowe*, "non-Northern." The situation in northern texts of this date is, of course, much more complicated than that. The remark on p. xxviii, footnote 2, that double consonants are "possibly of dialectal significance" is to be taken with caution: after long vowels they are particularly common in northern texts, but in most cases they seem to have no *phonetic* significance,⁴ and they can give no help in locating a text precisely.

The following textual points may be noted:

- 12/18, 19. The MS. has "Tak a bryghte bacyn and anynte it with mylke reme." Dr. Ogden's *mylke* [Σ] *reme*, (*reme* taken to mean "rheum" presumably, cf. 2/25, since no other word is glossed), is unnecessary. For *mylke-reme*, "cream," cf. Stratmann-Bradley, *milk-rem*, and v. N.E.D., *ream*. sb.¹
- 33/14. For *ofstesones* leg. *efstesones*? cf. 48/15. On *o* miswritten for *e*, cf. 6/14 and 3/30.
- 58/37. *caldes agayn es kynde*: *es* for *his* would be unusual, and it seems rather that the true reading is *caldes agaynes kynde*, "grows unwontedly cold." The parallel from *Reliquiae Antiquae*, *waxes calde agayne kynde*, supports this. *Kynde* here has nothing to do with the *kynd* of 30/28.

¹ It is misleading to say, p. xxvi, that *o*-spellings for OE. *ā* "are grouped in a few recipes." They are particularly common between 18/35 and 19/36, but elsewhere they occur sporadically.

² It would have been better, perhaps, to print as side-notes only what was written in the margin of the MS. E.g. on fol. 285^v, the words "Item ad vocem," etc., go between "cotidie" and "absinthium" in the body of the text, which position is not precisely indicated in the printed text. On the same folio (13/27) the MS. does not repeat *hafe* as alleged.

³ E.g. the *Morte Arthure* (ed. E. Brock, E.E.T.S. 8), and the prose texts (ed. G. G. Perry, E.E.T.S. 20 and 26). The general agreement of the *Liber* with the language of the prose texts as against the *Morte Arthure* is clear.

⁴ Cf. K. Luick, *Studien zur englischen Lautgeschichte*, p. 17.

- 61/34. *In pe litage* is clearly contrasted with *in pe fransie*, 61/30 (cf. also 62/2, 3); the word then has no connection with *litarge* "litharge," but is probably an error for "*litarge*," "lethargy," with the same *t* for *th* as in the other word.
- 70/1, 2, 3. As printed, the passage seems to contain three imperatives in *-s*. Among the very numerous imperatives in the text, there are no other instances with *-s*, and it is probable that the punctuation should be altered and the passage written, "... *anoþer tym at euen. Þis drynk gars . . .*" With this, compare 75/24, 5.
- 74/21. For the second & leg. *a*? In this text the abbreviation for *and* bears a close resemblance to the letter *a*.

Since the glossary records words like *all*, *also*, *or*, one might have expected records of such words as *serche*—"to probe a wound," 69/17, 23; *wympill*—"silk" here? 69/26; *schedde*—"crown of the head," 6/16; *foure swarede*—"square," 18/32 (not recorded in the *N.E.D.* before 1535, but found in the *Chronicle of Thomas Castleford*, fol. 199ⁿ). The adverbial *on crose*—"across," 18/32, is worthy of note. Under *glett* the definition would be better as "phlegm" merely, for at 24/34 the reference is not to the stomach but to the heart. Under *pokett*, i.e. "a small poke or bag," the words "worn on the person" are misleading. *Coylett* seems to mean "strained liquid" rather than "the residue of straining," v. especially 36/11. *Teme*, 64/36, means simply "pour," as in modern northern dialects, and need not be referred to *temce*—"to strain," which occurs in another passage. *Rescheyue*, 28/12, is surely a northern form of the verb "receive," cf. the form *reschayfe* cited in the *N.E.D.* *Schire* does not designate a "mixture," but refers specifically to clear and in this case melted fat, cf. the *schyre grece* of *Gawain*. For *gundy*, a definition "bleared" would be more accurate, cf. OE. *gund*—"puss." *Falde*, 70/35, is clearly adverbial.

A few misprints have crept into the text and glossary. 22/26, for *peþir* leg. *peþir*. 45/side-note 2, for *pe* leg. *pe*. 72/16 and glossary, *encruce*, but *entruce* in the note. Glossary; under *Brandreth*, for ON. *brand-reið* leg. ON. *brand-reið*; under *Hasenes* for OE. *hasnes*, leg. OE. *hāsnes*; under *Host* for ON. *hoste* leg. ON. *hósti*; under *Kile*, for ON. *kyli* leg. ON. *kyli*; under *Triddils*, for OF. leg. OE. In derivations containing OE. *æ*, the digraph is always printed *ae*.

ANGUS MCINTOSH.

John Skelton. An Account of his Life and Writings. By L. J. LLOYD. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1938. Pp. viii + 152. 10s. 6d. net.

"This little book does not claim to be anything more than an introduction to its subject. . . . I have attempted to suggest that Skelton is worth considerably more attention than has usually been given to him by readers of poetry, in the hope that they may be induced to discover for themselves what manner of man was the Rector of Diss."

THUS modestly, Mr. Lloyd prefaces his pleasant little discussion of Skelton, a book addressed not to scholars, but to readers of poetry; and if the sub-title suggests an unfortunate comparison,¹ Mr. Lloyd would himself be the first to agree that much of what has been printed about Skelton since 1843 is a compliment to the zeal and learning of the Rev. Alexander Dyce. That Mr. Lloyd sheds no new light on Skelton is immaterial; it was not his purpose to do so. The only question is whether Skelton is properly introduced by this new work to the class of readers to whom it makes its appeal.

The answer must be affirmative. Mr. David Garnett in *The New Statesman and Nation*, December 31, 1938; Mr. Philip Henderson, himself an editor of a popular edition of Skelton, in *The Spectator*, January 13, 1939; *The Times Literary Supplement*, February 11, 1939; and several other journals have already given the book a favourable reception. Mr. Garnett, it is true, objects to Lloyd's "exasperating" biographical assumptions; but the exasperation, one feels, is too good-humoured to be quite worthy of so strong a term. To have passed inspection of these guardians of public taste, Mr. Lloyd must be granted to have achieved at least half of the purpose of introduction: to dispose readers kindly toward Skelton.

The other half consists in presenting Skelton accurately; and Lloyd has interpreted, so far as he has gone, correctly. Indeed, his summary, pp. 139-40, is a very neat, pleasing, and sufficient piece of work. One might object that throughout there is an over-simplification that hardly does justice to the many-sided and complex "Vicar of Hell"; but it is perhaps justifiable on the ground that the book is an introduction. To get the full weight of this over-simplification, one need only compare Ramsay's very thorough dissertation on

¹ The full title of Dyce's edition is: "The Poetical Works of John Skelton, with Notes, and Some Account of the Author and his Writings."

*Magnyfycence*¹ with Lloyd's discussion which is admittedly based upon it, or set Mr. William Nelson's brilliant interpretation of *Speke, Parrot*² beside Lloyd's thin treatment. J. M. Berdan's scholarly researches on Skelton's verse forms, etc.,³ belong to a different world from this work which they have influenced. Taking this reduction of the complex to the elementary, and in a corresponding degree of wealth to poverty, as inherent in the purpose of a "sketch," however, one finds many remarks that definitely and gratifyingly hit the nail on the head, as, for example, on p. 65: "No one in his senses would suggest that *Elynour Rummyng* has anything to do with refinement, but it is at least a great deal more wholesome than much of *A Sentimental Journey*."

Possibly a technical examination of the methods whereby Skelton achieves his effects would also be more pleasing to "readers of poetry" than the summaries of poems which fill so large a part of the book.

Though scholars may quite properly object to the multitudinous baseless assumptions, it must be admitted that most of them are of little consequence and are introduced only for the sake of pleasantness, to adorn the tale. But there is at least one assumption less innocent. On p. 23, Lloyd says:

"It cannot be doubted that he firmly made up his mind soon after his retirement [to Diss] that the task to which he would devote his life was that of criticism; criticism not only of the political or ecclesiastical situation but of every ill to which the land was subject."

There is in truth not a scrap of evidence that he made up his mind to anything of the sort; but the fault is deeper than that: the underlying assumption is false to what we know of Skelton's character. There was nothing deliberate about him. His life, like his own satires, just boiled along, and was full of afterthoughts and postscripts. And, as a matter of fact, it is just the question of motivation for his satires that has proved a stumbling block to all students of his life.

There may be differences of opinion as to how well the author of an introduction ought to know his subject. Although the title of Lloyd's book would lead one to expect a discussion of all his writings,

¹ E.E.T.S., Extra Series, xcvi, 1906.

² P.M.L.A., LI (1936), pp. 59-82.

³ *Early Tudor Poetry*, New York: Macmillan, 1920, Chapters II, III.

there is no account of Skelton's prose work as prose, nor of his Latin work in verse and prose, nor of his skill as a translator. These we may take to be deliberate omissions. But there are several evidences that the author does not know his scholarship as well as he might, even though the literature that deals with Skelton is not extensive. For example, in treating of Garnesche and the Garnesche flyting, Lloyd gleans nothing from the very informative article that Miss Helen Stearns published in 1928.¹ In recording Skelton's early years, he does not suspect that he may have been tutor to Prince Arthur as well as Prince Henry, and he neglects other biographical possibilities which the discovery of the *Speculum Principis* brought to light.² In fact, though he does not list the *Speculum* among the lost works, he is content to say of *Magnyfycence*: "The source of the play may indeed be the *Speculum Principis* though the suggestion is at best of doubtful value." It is surely not unkind to point out that, as the *Speculum* was first published in 1935, Mr. Lloyd was in a better position to decide the matter than Ramsay was in 1906. Again, on p. 75, with reference to the cryptogram of *Ware the Hawke*, he says, "He [Skelton] calls this one a 'tabull playne,' but so far it has eluded all attempts at solution." On the contrary, Henry Bradley showed in 1896 that the puzzle was really quite simple, and explained both this cryptogram and that of the *Garlande of Laurell*³; and Berdan, to whom Lloyd professes to be indebted, refers to Bradley's explanation on p. 175 of his *Early Tudor Poetry*. Moreover, Richard Hughes in 1924, apparently independently, worked out the *Garlande* cipher which is built on the same system, and translated the Latin.⁴ One might point out other unused sources of information about Skelton, but enough has been said to make the point.

Nevertheless, one must object to the misquotation of M. R. James. On p. 141, in connection with Skelton's translation of Diodorus Siculus, Lloyd says:

"It has been suggested that at least part of it [Corpus Christi, Cambridge, MS. 357] is a holograph: Dr. M. R. James speaks of 'the first three leaves written by Skelton in a large Gothic hand.' This is on the whole unlikely, but the opinion of so great a paleographer cannot be summarily dismissed."

¹ "John Skelton and Christopher Garnesche," *M.L.N.*, XLIII, 518-23.

² *Speculum*, IX, 25-37.

³ *The Academy*, August 1, 1896.

⁴ *Poems by John Skelton*, London: W. Heinemann, 1924.

James makes no such statement about this manuscript; he does make it about CC. MS. 432.¹ The latter is a thirteenth century copy of the *Chronique de Reims*,² which Skelton presented to Henry VIII. Presentation verses, etc., occupy the first three pages,³ and there are some annotations also in the margins of the text, all written in "a large Gothic hand" which must date c. 1500. Under the circumstances, James was probably correct in saying that the hand is Skelton's; there is at least an a priori likelihood. But it happens also that the manuscript of Skelton's *Speculum Principis*, which also seems to be a presentation copy, is exactly similar in make-up, a fact which compliments James.

It would be manifestly unfair, however, to condemn as unscholarly a book which makes no pretence at scholarship. Mr. Lloyd's work is pleasant, readable, fairly correct in that emphasis in which interpretation largely consists, and it should serve its purpose of stirring up more popular interest in Skelton.

F. M. SALTER.

Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. By E. CASADY. New York: The Modern Language Association of America (Revolving Fund Series, viii); London: H. Milford. 1938. Pp. xii+257. 11s. 6d. net.

MR. CASADY'S use of the work of earlier students of Surrey shows a just appreciation of their achievements. In particular his tribute to the "comprehensiveness" of Nott's work which was accomplished as he reminds us "without the help of modern critical apparatus," comes with singular aptness from one whose own thoroughness as an investigator is clearly quite exceptional. Mr. Casady has pondered his subject for some ten years, in the course of which he has completely changed the views he put forward in an earlier dissertation; he has also worked over the original sources afresh and appears to be thoroughly acquainted with all that has been written about Surrey from Puttenham's day to our own. It is not surprising, therefore, that his is the most complete and accurate narrative of the poet's life that we possess.

¹ *A Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS. in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, Cambridge University Press, 1911-12, II, 339.

² This work was edited from a French manuscript by Louis Paris in 1837.

³ Partly published by Dyce, I, 147. Dr. H. L. R. Edwards made good Dyce's omissions in an article to which Lloyd refers, *P.M.L.A.*, LII (1938), 601.

His main aim, however, has been not to add to the material accumulated by his predecessors but to review their conclusions in the light of modern theories of social and economic determinism, and to suggest an explanation of Surrey's downfall more in accord with the facts of history than that which has hitherto been generally received.

In Mr. Casady's view Surrey was the victim equally of the position he inherited and of the powerful forces that were transforming the social, religious, and political structure of mid-Tudor England. Only in his literary life was he truly free and not bound by tradition ; in every other sphere, and in regard to politics and religion especially, his outlook and actions were conditioned by the circumstances of his birth. The fact that he was heir to the Duke of Norfolk and so to the leadership of the old Catholic nobility made it inevitable that he should focus in his own person the implacable hostility of the conservative nobles to the " new " men, whose tenure of power depended on the success of their efforts to effect a radical change in the system of government in Church and State. When to Surrey's inherited opposition were added the force of his fiery personality, his brilliant abilities, fierce temper, intolerant pride, and hatred of compromise, conflict to the death with those who strove with equal determination and greater unscrupulousness for the triumph of the principles he abhorred could hardly have been avoided under much more favourable conditions than existed in the last years of Henry VIII. Hence, when the rapid decline in the king's health towards the end of 1546 appeared to threaten the continuance in power of the Earl of Hertford and the group who represented the reforming tendencies in the Privy Council, Surrey's injudiciously expressed desire for a Council of Regency presided over by his father, the premier duke of England, gave the " new erected men " their long-awaited opportunity to destroy him.

It is regrettable on many grounds that Mr. Casady has adopted an extreme determinist interpretation of history, and not least because it has led him to over-simplify the issue between Surrey and his foes—more prominence ought surely to have been given to the Catholic manoeuvres for a Norfolk regency, even though documentary evidence for them is as scanty as it is for some of the moves of Hertford which Mr. Casady accepts. Nevertheless, it is clear that the strength of his case lies largely in his mastery of the political history of Henry VIII's later years and his ability to indicate the

significance of the major events of Surrey's life against that larger background; at the same time he has little difficulty in exposing the unhistorical basis of the traditional opinion that Surrey himself was the cause of his own ruin—by his folly and overweening pride, and his lack of balance and practical wisdom.

In considering Surrey's poetry Mr. Casady usefully stresses the contrast between the fruitlessness of his active life of opposition to political change and the permanent value of his achievement as the founder of a new poetical tradition. Of the two appendices he devotes to this portion of his subject the first, based largely on the conclusions of recent American scholarship, is given up to a discussion of the ways in which Surrey enriched the English literary tradition; and though the author breaks no new ground and scarcely does justice to the merits of Wyatt's poetry, his account of Surrey's stylistic innovations and refinement of the language, his experiments in the sonnet form and in blank verse, and the principles that informed his work as a translator from Latin and Italian will provide useful guidance for younger students. In the second appendix Mr. Casady has ably set out the history of the fallacious tradition of Surrey's love for "the faire Geraldine" and its influence on the popular conception of the poet and the interpretation of his poetry.

The book is provided with a useful index.

I noted about a dozen misprints, mostly of proper names.

H. J. BYROM.

The Comedy of Acolastus: Translated from the Latin of Fullonius by John Palsgrave. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by P. L. CARVER. (E. E. T. S. Original Series No. 202.) London: Oxford University Press. 1937 (for 1935). Pp. civ+312. 20s. net.

PALSGRAVE's translation of *Acolastus* is certainly a curiosity if not a freak in the history of classical education in England. It appeared in 1540, and does not seem to have been reprinted until now. Its editor gives no account of the original author, Gulielmus Fullonius, nor of the original publication in Holland in 1529. He contributes an introduction of over one hundred pages, much of it prolix and moralizing, especially in the first half. The second half seeks mainly to establish the importance of Palsgrave's translation in the

sixteenth century, but no evidence for its use after 1540 is produced. The special pleading that Shakespeare had read the translation as a schoolboy and remembered odd phrases sufficiently well to be able to reproduce them in middle life is not based on evidence that any schoolboy was reading, in 1574, when Shakespeare was ten, a school-book not reprinted since 1540, but on two or three verbal parallels. Shakespeare's use of these few phrases may be due to their proverbial nature. Surely the whole point of Palsgrave's second interpretation of the Latin he is translating phrase by phrase is that he wishes to bring to the notice of his scholar or scholars the exact English colloquial equivalents in use in 1540. The fact that some of these have not been discovered in use before that date is no argument that they were as yet unknown.

In this respect the weakness of the editor's position is shown by a study of the notes. Only on rare occasions does he quote from any work published before 1520. For usages of words and phrases he seems, indeed, to have relied mainly on the *O.E.D.* Within limits this is, of course, legitimate, but it leads him, on at least one occasion to confuse the "earliest occurrence" of a word or phrase and its "earliest known occurrence." He is thus much too prone to claim of a particular word or phrase, as on p. 257, at top, that "Palsgrave may be supposed to have originated the phrase, as there is no earlier record of its occurrence." No record in what? If in the *O.E.D.*, then the editor will learn how defective is even that great work in the recording of earliest occurrences. He has, of course, discovered some instances for himself.

In seeking to create favour for Palsgrave's translation the editor fails to view the educational experiments and suggestions of the sixteenth century as a whole, a stage in the history of education in England. He seems to have a poor view of the schoolmasters of the day, and his citation of Holofernes and Sidney's schoolmaster Rombus would seem, at first sight, to justify his strictures. But was the monstrous Latinized language spoken by Holofernes and Rombus peculiar to pedant schoolmasters? Harvey mimics the exactly similar diction of a miller [*Letter Book*, p. 92]. Indeed, the letter of the good aldermen of London to Henry V, cited by Professor R. W. Chambers, belongs to the same school of pretenders to culture, the attacks on which continue, in different forms, into Addison and Pope's attacks on False Wit and probably into Sheridan's ridicule of Mrs. Malaprop.

The editor is on surer ground when he is discussing the monosyllabic school, but instead of calling on Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique* to bear general witness against Gascoigne [p. lxxxvi], he could have found a direct answer to his quotation from Gascoigne in Harvey's *Marginalia*, p. 169. "The more monosyllables that you vse," says Gascoigne, "the truer Englishman you shall seeme." Harvey replies: "Non placet. A great grace and Majesty in longer wordes, so they be current English. . . . [added later] Sir Philip Sidney, & M. Spenser of mie opinion." Harvey does not mean that monosyllables must not be used: he means that polysyllables must not be excluded, so long as they suit the genius of the language.

These two items are part of the history of English prose; it might be said that the editor is none too sure of his ground here.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

Shakespeare's Sonnet-Sequence. By DENYS BRAY. London: Martin Secker. 1938. Pp. xii+246. 12s. 6d. net.

SIR DENYS BRAY is the author of *The Original Order of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (1925) in which he presented a new order for the sonnets, based upon linked rhymes. More recently this order has gained a wider currency through its adoption by Mr. Ridley in his edition of the Sonnets in the New Temple Shakespeare (1934); and (from a different point of view) the problem of the order has also been considered, and a revised sequence presented, by Professor Tucker Brooke in his valuable edition of the sonnets (O.U.P., London, New York, 1936). This fuller presentation of Sir Denys Bray's interesting theory is therefore timely. As in the earlier work, the full text of the Sonnets in their new order is given; there are several minor differences between the present order and that previously suggested by Sir Denys and one radical change in the "Dark Lady" group; and there is also a "running analysis of the linking" demonstrating the continuity of sense, the word-articulations and the rhyme-links, in convenient tabular form.

The problem may be briefly summarized. The order of the 1609 Quarto is by general admission unsatisfactory. There are, however, several pairs and other groups of sonnets so clearly linked in sense or syntax as to be inseparable. These pairs and groups are also sometimes linked by rhyme-words. The apparently conscious use of such

inking and the allied practice of repeated lines and half-lines can be demonstrated from some other Elizabethan sonnet-sequences; it could indeed be a natural result of the Elizabethan poet's vivid consciousness of sound and of formal pattern, as well as his love of intricacy for its own sake and (to some extent) his sense of the group of sonnets rather than the single sonnet as the unit. These facts point to the possibility that Shakespeare's sonnets might be regrouped on the basis of rhyme-links so as to yield a greater continuity of sense; and this is what Sir Denys Bray has done. He has allowed for and answered many criticisms of his theory, both actual and possible, and he has presented his data fully and fairly. One weakness he freely admits, though without perhaps giving it sufficient weight; his theory does not include any explanation of how the order of the 1609 text came to exist at all. (That Shakespeare deliberately "broke the chain" seems very improbable.) Nor, although he is obviously aware of the relevant facts (p. 64 n.), does he sufficiently allow, in his examples of conscious linking from Daniel and Drayton, for their revisions of order in successive editions; this fact limits the value of the example on pp. 60-2.

But the new order must finally, even if unfairly, be judged by its impression on the reader. When the sonnets are read in this order and with an honest effort to discount one's prejudice in favour of the familiar, one must on the whole agree with Mr. Ridley that they form "a more coherent and readable series than the order of 1609." To the groups here called "Thoughts in absence," "Gathering suspicions," "Transgression and remorse" this judgment is particularly applicable. Existing groups which were already clearly linked in subject (such as the "exhortation to marry" and the "rival poet") are nowhere seriously modified. But in a few instances the loss quite outweighs the value of the newly discovered "links." "Since brass, nor stone, nor earth nor boundless sea" (65) here stands tenth in the sequence, preceded by 126 and followed by 15-16. Here it seems to me that Sir Denys Bray has (unusually) disturbed an inseparable group, for 63-65 surely form a tripartite poem of impressive unity. Less serious, but still regrettable, is the separation of 110 and 111, which should illuminate each other; in the other direction, the pairing of 76 and 123, which express very different attitudes to contemporary events, seems unfortunate. The running glosses added by Sir Denys (supplied, he says, not to summarize but to "bring out the central meaning") are sometimes

inadequate; for example "My mistress' eyes" (130) is glossed "for heaven alone has eye more bright" and "Alas, 'tis true I have gone here and there" (110) has "Take me back, though I have gone astray."

The sonnets are, after all, not merely jig-saw pieces having a mechanical or formal relationship and, when rightly grouped, telling a story. There are intangible bonds of mood and tone, which deserve at least as much consideration as the narrative and the formal pattern, and no order which does not fully respect these can be wholly satisfactory. Further, we know from the plays at least something of the way Shakespeare's style developed; this too should be taken into account, so that (to put it roughly) Troilus does not precede Romeo, as in the "new" order too often occurs.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences. Studies in Conventional Conceits. By LISLE C. JOHN. NEW YORK: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford. 1938. Pp. x+278. 14s. net.

THIS is a useful account of the origins, classical and mediæval, of the conventional imagery of the Elizabethan sonnet-sequence, with a detailed examination of some of the commoner conceits, under such headings as "Care-Charmer Sleep," "Wasting in Despair," "Sun and Stars." The value of this study is somewhat limited by the fact that its illustrations are, as the author admits, practically confined to the sequences included in Sir Sidney Lee's *Elizabethan Sonnets*, a collection which must surely soon be superseded. There should be an explicit reminder that Lee did not include Soowthern's *Pandora* (1584), E. C.'s *Emaricdulfe* (1595), Barnefield's *Cynthia* (1595), Alexander's *Aurora* (1604), Murray's *Cælia* (1611), Greville's *Cælica*, or the sonnets of Drummond of Hawthornden and Alexander Craige. (Of these, Alexander and Murray are also omitted from Miss John's brief introductory survey.) A warning is also necessary, since quotations are made from Lee, on the imperfections of his texts and especially his violent over-punctuation, which often gives a flagrantly false impression of the mood of a sonnet. One cannot help suspecting that Lee's notorious prejudice against the Elizabethan sonnet was at work here.

Despite her much wider knowledge and clearer understanding of the background of the Elizabethan sonnet-sequence, Miss John does not wholly escape Lee's prejudices. She is too apt to apologize for the sonnets—unless they are by Sidney, Spenser or Shakespeare, or otherwise certified ("yet, after all, Drayton was a genuine poet, and his 'Since there's no help, come, let us kiss and part' appears in every poetic anthology") and does not sufficiently discriminate between differences of treatment, even within the confines of her self-imposed aim, that of treating only the conventional conceits. It is too easy to ridicule Elizabethan hyperboles from a modern point of view; it would be more interesting to try to mark the point at which a hyperbole became ridiculous to the Elizabethans themselves. But this would involve a discussion of the development of the sonnet-vogue in relation to Elizabethan poetry (and particularly satire) as a whole.

Nevertheless, whatever one's opinion of this author's æsthetic judgments and the manner of their expression ("sonneteers an unconscionable time a-dying from wanhope and despair"; "later sonnets imply that Sidney got himself in hand"), it must be emphasized that her book contains some very helpful material for criticism of the Elizabethan sonnet-sequences, not only in her own examination of the conceits and tabulation of parallels but in her full and frequent references to many scattered books and articles on the subject. Her work is a valuable supplement to Miss Janet Scott's *Les Sonnets élisabéthains* (Paris, 1929).

There is in the notes (pp. 213-6) a useful examination of some of the special problems of Constable's sonnet-sequence; and an appendix discusses the evidence for the identification of Stella and the dating of Sidney's sonnets. Apart from these two poets, Miss John touches on biographical problems only in passing; sometimes perhaps too lightly, as in her habitual reference to the recipient of Shakespeare's Sonnets as "Will"; sometimes, as in her remarks on Drayton and Anne Goodere (p. 21, 134), she draws wrong conclusions and refers to out of date authorities. There is also a false implication in the quotation from Drayton on p. 213; the reference is to Soowthern's odes, not his sonnets, and the second verse quoted refers not to Soowthern but to odes in general. In the note on Daniel's *Delia* (p. 213) reference should have been made to A. C. Sprague's edition of *Poems and a Defence of Ryme* (Harvard University Press, 1930) which contains the only scholarly text of the

sonnets. It is unfortunate that the index does not cover the notes (pp. 205-57); this is presumably another disadvantage of the growing practice of "tail-notes" as opposed to footnotes.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

The Hamlet of Shakespeare's Audience. By J. W. DRAPER.
Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1938.
Pp. xii+254. \$3.

THE title of this book does not convey a precise idea of its contents. In the main it is a collection of—partly revised—essays dealing with the "supporting roles" in *Hamlet*, which have been printed before in a number of American and Continental periodicals. To these articles on Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, Polonius, Ophelia, Osric, etc., there has been added a discussion on the character of Hamlet, the plot, setting and theme of the play "comprising a full and systematic interpretation of the entire tragedy."

There is undoubtedly something to be learned from what the author calls his treatment of characters that "seem to have escaped systematic efforts at interpretation"; at any rate, his theory is sound that almost all figures of the tragedy have been looked at too much through the eyes of its protagonist. It is a pity, however, that his own interpretation does not always restore the balance. Up to a certain point, for instance, his defence of Queen Gertrude is quite convincing. It is indeed curious that to an unprejudiced eye she does not at all appear as the moral scarecrow Hamlet takes her for. Unfortunately, however, Draper's plea overshoots the mark. Most of his readers will be astonished to hear that "the Queen, though apparently she did not love Claudius and wished that her son might at least have been consulted, and though she shared with her age the horror of incest, nevertheless bowed to political necessity (!) and silenced her grief and her misgivings to save the nation and the dynasty" (208). There are quite a number of startling discoveries of this sort in Draper's book. Of Polonius we hear: "His high reputation implies that he at least had been a great prime minister" (50); of his son: "Perhaps Laertes thought that Hamlet killed Polonius in order the more easily to seduce Ophelia (65); of Marcellus and his companions, that they must be the king's Switzers, which is apparent from their ignorance of Danish history. Besides, "had they not been foreigners, they

surely would have constituted Hamlet's most obvious allies" (84); King Claudius, as a prince "occupied the disagreeable and anomalous position of a younger son disregarded or made light of by the court; and being more of a politician than a soldier, he was quite overshadowed in the popular mind by the king's military reputation . . . he fell desperately in love with the Queen, his brother's wife, and must have been particularly unhappy to cut so sorry a figure at her court." It is difficult to understand why the author did not notice that such statements violate the principle which he himself formulates on p. 98: "criticism is not justified in reading into a play elements that the text does not clearly state or imply." But here and elsewhere the author seems to forget entirely that he has not got to do with reality but with fiction, which cannot do without certain conventions, for instance, the characters whom Dryden calls the "protactic persons," who are always as ignorant as Marcellus because they are indispensable "to hear the relation" by which the audience is informed.

In dealing with the problem of the character of Hamlet, the author rejects the conception of Hamlet's belonging to the melancholy type, which is comparatively easy if you give an inadequate impression of the theoretical utterances on melancholy of the time, shut your eyes to the related figures of the contemporary drama, ignore his soliloquies and pay no regard to the characteristic details of his attitude and behaviour, not troubling yourself with such things as the handling of Polonius' corpse or his "fit" in the churchyard. Draper's point of view here is partly—as with other critics—determined by ideas concerning the necessary dignity of an Elizabethan tragic hero. These are not altogether unfounded, but are not Hieronimo and the lachrymose Antonio (*Antonio and Mellida*) Elizabethan tragic heroes as well?

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

Shakespeare's Influence on the Drama of his Age studied in "Hamlet." By D. J. MCGINN. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1938. Pp. xiv+241. \$3.00.

DISSATISFIED with the present uncertainty concerning the extent of Shakespeare's influence on his fellow dramatists and the general tendency to regard it as slight, Dr. McGinn here attempts a fuller enquiry than has yet been made into the influence of *Hamlet* down

to 1642. In the first part of his book he examines those plays which, as wholes, show clearest evidence of kinship with Shakespeare's play—*Antonio's Revenge*, *Hoffman*, *Bussy d'Ambois*, the *Atheist's Tragedy*, *Unnatural Combat*, *Fatal Contract*, and *Aglaure* (Chs. II–III); devotes a chapter to the study of the influence of *Hamlet* on Beaumont and Fletcher's *Four Plays in One*, *Philaster*, and *Maid's Tragedy* (Ch. IV), and then gives an account of the imitation of characters and individual scenes from *Hamlet* (Chs. V–VI) and of burlesque of *Hamlet* (Ch. VII). A final chapter summarizes the evidence of the second part of the book, in which are assembled more than four hundred extracts (ranging from phrases or single lines to substantial passages) which testify to the acquaintance of later dramatists with Shakespeare's play.

Dr. McGinn starts his investigation from premises which may not, I think, be correct: namely, that a revival of revenge tragedy took place *c.* 1600 and that this must be ascribed to the influence of either Shakespeare's *Hamlet* or Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*; having next adduced evidence for his belief that Shakespeare's was the earlier play, he then considers later revenge tragedies with *Hamlet* as the proven prototype in mind. The process from *c.* 1600 on seems to me less the establishment of a new pattern than the disintegration of the old, and readers of the first four chapters of the book will, I think, feel that *Hamlet's* influence as a revenge play is overstated. Fuller recognition of individual traits that set no pattern (*e.g.* the Claudius type of villain), of older plot devices that it failed to keep alive (*e.g.* the Ghost and the inset play), and of the petering out of the red corpuscles of revenge tragedy in the anæmic strain of *Philaster*, the *Maid's Tragedy*, and *Unnatural Combat*, would, I think, have made this part of the enquiry critically better balanced. The later chapters are more convincing, especially that on the imitation of scenes from *Hamlet*—which, incidentally, shows that of the four most frequently imitated (Laertes' farewell to Ophelia, the arrival of the Players, the closet scene, and the graveyard scene) only one is at all closely linked with the revenge plot.

The numerous echoes of *Hamlet* assembled in the second part of the book are a valuable and interesting supplement to the *Shakespeare Allusion Book*. Many of these, as Dr. McGinn suspects, will fail to carry conviction: some are more patently echoes of the *Spanish Tragedy* than of *Hamlet*; others represent no more than proverbial or colloquial phrases that were current coin of their

day; and not a few lack the stamp of distinctively Shakespearean mintage. By far the majority, however, stand question. One wonders how far an examination of the non-dramatic literature of the period would have revealed an equally impressive body of evidence for the extent to which Jacobean and Caroline writers knew their *Hamlet*. Consideration of this question would, I think, have provided a safer and more stabilizing basis for Dr. McGinn's investigation than his opening premises.

Perhaps the greatest service of the book is that it stimulates enquiry. Dr. McGinn's co-ordination of what has long been known with what has hitherto been inadequately recognized and the interpretations offered of the data make the problems more definite and more interesting than before. Another pleasing feature of the work that commands respect is the care with which the proofs have been read and its scrupulous avoidance of anything slovenly.

ALICE WALKER.

Sir William D'avenant, Poet Laureate and Playwright-Manager. By A. H. NETHERCOT. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1938. Pp. viii+488. 20s. net.

THIS new life of Davenant¹ comes very soon after Dr. Harbage's study of 1935, but Dr. Nethercot's interest in his subject and treatment of his materials are very different, and he has much new biographical material to add from various sources.

He is concerned with Davenant "mainly as a man of the theater," and examines the plays, masques, and entertainments from the point of view of the box office, paying more heed to their contemporary repute than to their intrinsic worth. This attitude is in keeping with his reading of Davenant's character, but it does less than justice to the poetic merits of the plays, and it leads to inadequacy of treatment when it is adopted towards *Gondibert*.

Dr. Nethercot compares Dr. Harbage's avowed whitewashing of Davenant's character with the blackwashing of "the school of Edmund Gosse and the squeamish older biographers," and calls

¹ Dr. Nethercot observes that the poet spelled his name D'avenant in print and Davenant in manuscript. To quote Jack Pumpkinhead, it's "Cy at the door and Peter in the house. How dreadfully confusing."

his own painting a greywash enlivened by dashes of yellow. This esoteric description proves to mean believing everything and the worse the better, but treating it as matter for amusement rather than for moral condemnation. Of course it is quite permissible to believe the later reports that Davenant was or said he was Shakespeare's bastard, but of some other evidence Dr. Nethercot seems to me to be uncritically credulous. The pedigree which he has found in the College of Arms, prepared for Davenant's grandson in 1725 to support the claim to an illustrious Lombard ancestry, is not at all reliable, without confirmation, as evidence for the family history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and, however interesting are the references to Davenant which he has garnered from verse satires and hostile news-letters, they are not necessarily veridical, even when there is nothing to take their place if we suspect them.

The same abhorrence of a void makes Dr. Nethercot reluctant to leave an isolated fact in isolation or an unexplained action without explanation, and induces in him a fertility of conjecture which the evidence does not warrant. For instance, Davenant writes from St. Germain to Sir Richard Browne at the French court, "I understand I have 2 children newly arrived at Paris," and makes arrangements that they may be cared for (pp. 224-5). It is legitimate to try to guess which children they were, but it is impossible to draw any useful inferences from the tone and phrasing of this stray letter. It is idle to observe that Davenant manifests no desire to see his children, does not name them, and does not tell where they came from; the circumstances of the letter, of which we know nothing, may well have made it unnecessary or in part improper. One does not speak of "my dear precious Toto" in applying for a dog licence. There is nothing in the letter to suggest that the poet's wife was "left behind, forgotten and forlorn, in some English country town"; she may indeed have been dead, but there is no ghost of a reason for suggesting that if so she died either in childbirth or of a disease caught from her loose-living husband. This is only one example of the author's addiction to guessing, which pervades the whole book and accounts for a good deal of its length.

In addition to the pedigree already mentioned and the allusions in contemporary pamphlets, Dr. Nethercot has found and printed a Chancery Complaint of Davenant against the tailor John Urswick, dated November 30, 1632, with Urswick's Answer, dated December 10, 1632, from which we learn something more about Davenant's

early years in London ; and, most striking of all, he has tracked down a number of new documents concerned with Davenant's killing of the tapster or ostler Thomas Warren. All that had previously been known of this was an undated petition to the King by Mary Davenant for her husband's pardon, bearing an authority, dated April 12, 1638, for the issue of the pardon. Dr. Nethercot has found the enrolment of the pardon on April 27, 1638, and from its recital of the facts has unearthed the report of the coroner's inquest, the Gaol Delivery record, and the King's Termination of the Inquisition. Unfortunately he has gone astray over the dating of these documents through failing to observe that the regnal year of Charles I began on March 27. The copy of the findings of the coroner's court contains a plain discrepancy in dates, making the coroner inquire into Warren's death a year before it occurred. It is necessary to amend this into consistency by dating either the death a year earlier or the inquest a year later. Dr. Nethercot chooses the latter alternative, without realizing that this makes the coroner report his inquisition to the justices, and the King determine it, some months before it was held. If Dr. Nethercot wishes to assign these events to 1633 he must emend the dates of these two later documents as well, but I have little doubt that we should adopt the other alternative, and place the events in 1632, the year of the proceedings against Urswick.¹ This would entail important changes in Dr. Nethercot's reconstruction of Davenant's movements and motives in that year, but he is generally ready to consider alternative interpretations of the evidence, and the revised dating

¹ The copy of the coroner's report begins, in Dr. Nethercot's translation, "*Essex*—Inquisition taken at Brayntry in the said county, 6 February, 7 Charles I," but thereafter refers repeatedly to the death as having occurred in "the aforesaid eighth year." In the following table I give the dates (1) as they occur in the documents without emendation, (2) as Dr. Nethercot emends them, and (3) as I think he should emend them. I write calendar years reckoning from January 1, with February 1632 for 1631/2 and 1633 for 1632/3 :

	Report of Inquest		Gaol Delivery and Termination (Two separate documents)
	Death	Inquest	
(1) Documents :	5 Feb., 8 Chas. I (1633)	6 Feb., 7 Chas. I (1632)	4 July & 16 Nov., 8 Chas. I (1632).
(2) Nethercot :	5 Feb., 8 Chas. I (1633)	6 Feb., 8 Chas. I (1633)	4 July & 16 Nov., 8 Chas. I (1632).
(3) Proposed :	5 Feb., 7 Chas. I (1632)	6 Feb., 7 Chas. I (1632)	4 July & 16 Nov., 8 Chas. I (1632).

I take it that the scribe who copied the coroner's report got the date right the first time and thereafter inadvertently substituted the number of the regnal year in which he himself was writing. The preamble of the pardon in 1638 incorporates the inconsistent dates of the documents on which it evidently relied. I have not seen any of these documents and base my argument on Dr. Nethercot's printed versions of them.

might yield a more coherent and plausible and certainly a better-documented account.

The amount of conjecture in Dr. Nethercot's book makes it necessary to read him with caution, but the wealth of new material which he has found demands attention, and his portrait of Davenant as a business man of the theatre is convincing as far as it goes, though I do not think it is the whole truth.

A. K. McILWRAITH.

The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Volume the First. *A Tale of a Tub* with other Early Works 1696-1707. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1939. Pp. xl+311. 10s. 6d. net.

IT is a tribute to the genius of Swift and his mastery of English prose that, despite the ephemeral interest, for most readers, of much that he wrote, a number of complete editions of his works, of some, if varying, editorial value, stand on library shelves; and there are many reprints of no independent worth. In 1735 George Faulkner, the Dublin printer, began the series with four volumes, which grew to twenty by 1772. The Pope and Swift *Miscellanies* of 1727-8 had developed, by 1746, to something like a set of Swift's works. In 1754-5 came Hawkesworth's edition for the London trade, issued in opposition to Faulkner's Dublin edition. This, by 1779, ran to fourteen volumes in handsome quarto. Additions were made to the later volumes of this set by Bowyer, Deane Swift, and John Nichols. This trade edition was the basis of Thomas Sheridan's edition in seventeen volumes, 1784, and of Nichols's edition in nineteen volumes, 1801. Sir Walter Scott's edition of 1814, in nineteen volumes, came next. This, and Nichols's edition, still have value. There is not much to be said for Thomas Roscoe's two ungainly volumes of 1841. A gap of over fifty years followed before the publication of Temple's Scott's edition of the prose works in twelve volumes, 1897-1908. This is now partly out of print; the text is not satisfactory; and as a whole it is, as Professor Herbert Davis remarks, "in part out of date." During the past twenty years the bibliography, the text, and the canon of Swift's writings have been tested with an exactness never before attempted; and manuscript material, unused by previous editors, has come to light.

A new edition of Swift's prose works is, therefore, welcome ; and, happily, Professor Herbert Davis has undertaken a task for which he is peculiarly fitted, as his valuable edition of *The Drapier's Letters* bears witness. The present edition, to be completed in fourteen volumes, is designed as a library set for the exacting reader. An elaborately documented edition of the works is more than one man could well hope to compass in a lifetime. This Professor Davis does not attempt. His purpose is to furnish a sufficient, accurate, and scholarly guide "for those who may prefer to read what Swift wrote, undisturbed by comment, reference, or textual trivialities." Thus the occasion and meaning of the publications included in this first volume are explained in a general introduction ; textual variants are tabulated at the end. A large part of the book is occupied by *A Tale of a Tub* and *The Battle of the Books*. A contrast in editorial design and scope is apparent if we turn to the Clarendon Press edition of these works, by Guthkelch and Nichol Smith, with its imposing documentation and close array of footnotes. More than anything Swift wrote, *A Tale of a Tub* reveals the extent of his general and uncommon reading. For most readers this is an unknown country whose features must be explained. The commentary of the Clarendon Press edition searches far and wide. But the imaginative genius of the *Tale* can well be understood without a minute knowledge of its allusions. And, with an eye upon earlier editions of the complete works, Professor Davis notes "three things which still remain to be done."

Earlier editors, if we exclude detailed work on a few writings, have paid insufficient regard to soundness of text ; the arrangement of the works has been uncritical ; and, with little attention to evidence, doubtful or spurious pieces have been included. Professor Davis proposes to provide a text giving "the final corrected and revised versions which appeared during Swift's lifetime." This will mean, when available, the use of Faulkner's early volumes, which Swift is known to have overseen. But, even here, many errors have crept in, which must be corrected by collation with original manuscripts, when they exist, or with the earliest editions. Secondly, the works will, for the first time, be arranged "as far as possible in the order in which they were written." A rigid chronological sequence would not, of course, be desirable, for certain writings must be grouped by subject matter. Thirdly, evidence which we now have will enable Professor Davis to reject some long-

standing attributions. Doubtful pieces will be relegated to appendices.

This edition of Swift's prose works will, therefore, when complete, provide a reference work for scholars and a good reading set for those who prefer to turn the pages untroubled by minutiae. Professor Davis has done well to set before himself three clear avenues of approach which can, save for doubtful sidetracks, be followed throughout. These volumes will, for the first time, give a considered and carefully collated text, and an intelligible arrangement of Swift's genuine works.

The first volume calls for little further remark. A large part of its content has already, as stated, been admirably edited. But, in addition to the matter of the Clarendon Press volume, Professor Davis's book contains, with careful textual notes, other early writings—*The Contests and Dissensions in Athens & Rome*, *A Meditation upon a Broomstick*, *Thoughts on Various Subjects*, *A Tritical Essay upon the Faculties of the Mind*, and the prefaces which Swift wrote for Temple's works. Further, the volume contains a frontispiece portrait of Swift, reproductions of the plates which appeared in the fifth edition of *A Tale of a Tub*, and facsimiles of title-pages.

A final word of praise must be accorded to Professor Davis's concise introduction, which, without parade of the knowledge it contains, embodies the essentials of recent research and commentary, and provides the reader with a sufficient understanding of the occasion and general purpose of the writings here printed.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Ballad Opera. By McADOO GAGEY. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. xii+260. 15s. net.

MR. GAGEY has written an interesting book on a subject which has, perhaps, little more than its neglect to commend it. He makes no claims for the literary worth of what he examines. Apart from the *Beggar's Opera*, which to all intents and purposes inaugurates the form in England, ballad opera can offer no masterpiece. But the work was worth doing if only for the reason that the rivulet of the ballad opera meanders through a meadow of margin. Ballad

opera touches on important other subjects. The index, for instance, contains 15 references to Pope and 11 to Swift. And, of course, Gay and Fielding are intimately concerned. (It is also worth mentioning that, in the *Jew Decoy'd* (1733), Mother Lurewell, an "ancient bawd," is urged to sing a tune of the days of Charles II and complies with Herrick's "Gather ye rosebuds . . ." with no mention of authorship [p. 75].) Moreover, the ballad opera is a handy medium for social, political, and literary satire and reference. From such supererogatory value this history of the ballad opera derives much of its interest for the student of eighteenth-century literature.

A ballad opera is defined by Mr. Gagey as "a play of three acts or fewer, usually but not necessarily in prose, interspersed with a variable quantity of songs, all or part of which are set to familiar or popular airs normally specified and numbered in the printed play." The form can scarcely have been expected to escape "an essential barrenness" (p. 133)—there were not enough popular tunes to be drawn on indefinitely—and, consequently, "as a distinct and important genre [it] lasted no longer than about a decade" (p. 219), beginning with its masterpiece in 1729 and "reach[ing] its apogee in 1733, although it managed to linger for a number of years thereafter" (p. 213). Mr. Gagey considers the origins of the form in older English drama, in the *commedia dell'arte* and in the *comédie en vaudevilles* (examples of which Gay may have seen played on his visits to France), and he shows how it passed into the comic opera of Bickerstaffe, Dibdin, Sheridan, and the rest. The variety of the material is conveniently illustrated by the titles of some of the chapters in this book: "Low-life Operas," "Pastoral and Village Operas," "Farce and Intrigue," "Satire and Burlesque," and "Topical Operas: Social Scandal and Politics." As the author realizes, his work ideally ought to have been done by "some interested and better-equipped scholar" who could have dealt with "the complicated subject of ballad-opera tunes"; Mr. Gagey felt himself justified in treating the subject "throughout from the standpoint of drama rather than of music . . . because the music is often incidental and never all-important" (p. viii). Until this ideal scholar arises, we shall not know how much interesting material Mr. Gagey has left unexplored. The music never became "all-important," of course: it is not even "all-important" in the *Magic Flute* or *Tristan*. But, along with the spectacle, the music must always be

thoroughly allowed for in estimating ballad operas. At least half the effect of even the *Beggar's Opera* comes from its tunes.

There is one other omission apparently unsuspected by Mr. Gagey, and so of less importance: the way in which the lyrics in the operas adapt phrases from better poetry. Pope's influence, for instance, is strong. Fielding, in *Miss Lucy in Town*, writes these lines (quoted on p. 148):

For manly Charms the British Dame
Shall feel a fiercer, nobler Flame;
To manly Numbers lend her Ear,
And scorn the soft enervate Air.

The last line appears to be a conscious reference to Pope's *Epistle to Augustus*, 151 ff.:

No wonder then when all was Love and sport,
The willing Muses were debauch'd at Court:
On each enervate string they taught the note
To pant, or tremble thro' an Eunuch's throat;

to which Pope appends the note: 'The Siege of Rhodes by Sir William Davenant, the first Opera sung in England.' The reference is relevant to Mr. Gagey's theme. And, to take another instance, Air VI of R. Fabian's *Trick for Trick* includes these lines (quoted on p. 123):

O how pleasing 'tis to languish,
When soft Wishes warm the Breast!
Sighs, in part, disclose our Anguish,
And our Blushes speak the rest. . . .

Obviously Fabian is remembering Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard*:

Let tears, and burning blushes speak the rest.

(in which Pope was remembering similar lines from one or all of the following: Dryden's *Tyrannic Love*, Settle's *Empress of Morocco*, and Mrs. Behn's *Paraphrase of Ovid's Cēnone to Paris*). The interest of such a borrowing lies in what it tells us (1) about the aspirations of Fabian and his kind—the sort of poetry they are wanting to echo; and (2) about the popularity of *Eloisa to Abelard*. If Mr. Gagey had followed up these literary echoes, he would have helped us to connect his theme to more of the general literature of the century. And in this instance he would have saved himself the unnecessary surprise at finding the Abailard-Héloïse matter forming the basis of William Hammond's ballad opera, *The Preceptor, or the Loves of Abelard and Héloïse*, acted at Smock Alley,

Dublin, in 1739. By 1739 the Abailard-Héloïse theme had declined into an ideal subject for ballad-opera. Hughes in 1714 had translated the "luscious" French version of their correspondence. Pope had based his epistle on that translation and already the stream of answering epistles was running well. Much of this material was to appear in a volume of 1747 with the significant title *Cupid Triumphant*. *The Preceptor* takes its place naturally in this company. The *reductio ad absurdum* which it represents has happened by logical steps. *The Preceptor* reminds us that many of the masterpieces of eighteenth-century literature stand just on, or an inch or two to the right of, a line dividing the good from the "luscious" or dirty or merely vulgar.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

Horace Walpole's Correspondence with the Rev. William Cole. Edited by W. S. LEWIS and A. DOYLE WALLACE. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Vol. I, pp. lxii+388; vol. II, pp. viii+464. 70s. net the two vols.

MR. LEWIS lists "three good reasons for a new edition of Horace Walpole's correspondence: to give a correct text, to include for the first time the letters to him, and to annotate the whole with the fulness that the most informative record of the time deserves." Some six thousand letters to and from Walpole (out of an estimated seven thousand) have been located and secured for use in this edition. The inaccurate and incomplete texts of former editions have been corrected; some three hundred letters from Walpole and two thousand letters to him will be published here for the first time. The complete correspondence will extend to some thirty or forty volumes. The letters are not printed as they were written: the editor and the advisory committee decided to retain the original punctuation and the spelling of proper names, but to normalize other spellings and capitalization. One can well believe that the decision was "by no means unanimous." A much less questionable decision was that of publishing the letters by correspondences and not chronologically. Most of the correspondences have a predominant subject, and with such a large number of correspondents and letters, chronological order would mean every other kind of confusion.

The present volumes are a good example. Here we have Walpole's correspondence with Cole admirably edited and indexed and complete. The main subject is English antiquities, with gout a second, and politics a bad third. Extracts from some fifty of Cole's letters to Walpole were printed in 1851; the present edition contains about one hundred and eighty. It cannot be said that the new letters are of outstanding importance. The correspondence was essentially formal. The antiquarian matters dealt with are known to us from other sources, though not necessarily from other writers. The letters do not reveal much that Cole's folios and diaries do not give, though one picks up some Cambridge gossip by the way. The importance of the correspondence was fundamentally the personal importance it had for the correspondents. Cole and Walpole differed in almost everything except their interest in England's antiquities, but they both, for different reasons, needed this correspondence. Walpole gained Cole's professional help and advice, and under Cole's influence his Gothicism tended to become less amateur. Cole gained the ear of his most admired author and was stimulated by Walpole's interest.

The text has been given a full and competent commentary. Frequently Cole's careful habits as an antiquarian help the editors: he was apt to add to his own draft of a letter names of people and elucidation of events referred to more generally in the copy Walpole received. But there were many allusions left for the editors to explain and very few are left unexplained in these volumes. Occasionally the notes are almost too complete: when Walpole writes of getting "the original roll of the Earls of Warwick, as long as my gallery," the note tells us that the roll was seven yards and a half long, twenty feet shorter than the long gallery at Strawberry Hill. But the annotations have the great virtue of being confined to facts. The only apparent source of information that has been neglected is the *Cambridge Chronicle* which Cole took every week. His references to it are not always correct. The mention of Walpole's gout in 1765 (I. 94) does not seem to be there. Cole's recollection of some verses in it which he thought were about William Cooke's extempore University Sermon is imperfect: the verses appeared on January 29, 1780 and Cooke's sermon was not preached until February 27. There is only one letter of Cole's that is missing, and it is possible that it was never written. Cole's diary for Sunday, May 15, 1768, says that he wrote to Walpole, but no letter with

that date is extant; Cole had written an eight-page letter to him on the previous day, and it is unlikely that he would write again so soon, or that if he did, all trace of it should have disappeared. Another letter (Walpole to Gray) is wrongly described as missing: Walpole wrote to Cole Jan. 10, 1771, "Mr. Gray will show you my answer to Dr. Milles" and the editors note that "HW's letter to Gray about it is missing" (I. 212). But Gray had just visited Walpole and the communication had been made verbally. The directions on p. xlix about the abbreviation "Sold London" do not appear to have been carried out. It is interesting that the foundation stone containing Cole's inscription (II. 311) for the 1784 new Guildhall of Cambridge is now being built into a wall of the 1939 new Guildhall.

Remembering the handy volumes of the Toynbees' edition the only criticism one can make of these volumes is that their bulk makes them difficult to hold. This edition will be three or four times as extensive as the Toynbees', and a bigger volume is necessary. Books like the Oxford edition of Gray's correspondence have shown, however, that it is not necessary to sacrifice convenience to achieve volume. Horace Walpole's letters have secured his claim to "the primacy of English letter-writers"; this edition finally marks the stage when they become an efficient reference book.

A. TILLOTSON.

Pride and Passion: Robert Burns, 1759-1796. By DE LANCEY FERGUSON. New York and London: Oxford University Press. 1939. Price 12s. 6d.

To all lovers of Burns Dr. De Lancey Ferguson, the editor of the Clarendon Press edition (1931) of the poet's *Letters*, is one of the benefactors of this generation. Not only did he give us by far the fullest collection of letters and by far the most accurate text. Here was an editor who had lived with his subject till he knew him through and through, and by furnishing exactly the right amount of note and commentary made Burns stand out and speak for himself as he had never done before.

This new book is therefore most welcome. It is not a professed biography, like Professor Snyder's or Mrs. Carswell's. Many Lives of Burns, Dr. Ferguson tells us in his preface—he certainly was not thinking of these recent ones—are dull; they somehow keep you

from getting at the man ; " how is it that the personality which blazes in the poems and glows in the letters only smoulders " in these ? This brilliant book is a character-study, and the author is thus relieved from constant attention to historical order. That, however, is well provided for by a full *Chronology*, giving every incident in the three broad divisions of Ayrshire, Edinburgh, and Dumfriesshire. The first of these covers twenty-seven years, the last ten ; the middle one is little more than one year, but it was the hinge that joined the others, and the turning-point of Burns's life ; what a brief and chequered *variorum* it all was ! The study thus prefaced consists of seven massive chapters, the first being a powerful if somewhat sombre picture of Scotland under *George III.* On that scene, and under these conditions, lived and worked this extraordinary human being. Dr. Ferguson's chapter-headings—" Education," " Men," " Women," " Livelihood," " Song,"—will indicate the fresh and striking way in which the theme is presented. There are no foot-notes ; but we are kept all the time so close to facts and documents, especially to the Letters, that the truth of the picture is beyond challenge.

The progress—it might almost be called a revolution—in Burns-study and appreciation during the last half-century is very remarkable. It did not begin with Henley and Henderson's Centenary edition (1896), or Andrew Lang's work of the same year, though both these gave it a great impetus. But there is no denying that till about that period the Scottish dialect had proved a very great, to many readers an insuperable, barrier. Burns was more difficult to read than Chaucer ; and things were made worse by the traditional arrangement of the *Poems*, where *The Twa Dogs*, and other pieces full of hurdles that still bar the way for all but specialists among the poet's own countrymen, meet the unwary reader on the very threshold. Wordsworth, it is true, does not seem to have been aware of any difficulty. From the first he hailed Burns as a universal poet—

He rules 'mid winter snows, and when
Bees fill their hives ;
Deep in the general heart of men
His power survives.

But then Wordsworth was himself a North Country man. To the average English reader the Scottish poet was a somewhat odd phenomenon, and while he might admit that some of this *patois* seemed wonderfully good, it would hardly strike him that this was

one of the poets of all time. Forty years ago Sir Arthur Quiller Couch—unwittingly, no doubt—helped towards the proper recognition of Burns, when in the *Oxford Book of English Verse* he gave him equal space with Keats and Shelley. Later, the Oxford edition of Burns also helped by throwing over the stereotyped arrangement and printing as first in order those amazing masterpieces, and almost free from traps—*Tam o' Shanter*, and *The Jolly Beggars*. Voices of authority ere this had been claiming for Burns his due. His finest critic, Andrew Lang, hardly goes too far when he ranks our poet with Sappho and Catullus, as the third supreme lyrist of the world. Sappho, he admits, is unapproachable; "the Tenth Muse does not compete with mortals." "But Catullus, with much of the fire, affection, and humour of Burns, has nothing like his range." This is certainly true; Burns's is indeed a many-sided power. Obviously he is very unequal; in his last recorded conversation, with Mrs. Walter Riddle, a few days before his death, he wished for time to cancel many unworthy things he knew he had written. But at his best, in those three hundred songs, in his all-round power—narrative and satire, humour, and pathos—with his immense vitality, his mastery of language, and the gay courage that takes our hearts by storm, his "brief natural sadness," and his universal human sympathy—

Gently scan your brother man,
Still gentler sister woman—

this chief of national poets shows himself to be something far more, a poet of mankind.

One's gratitude for this admirable book makes one regret all the more the title Dr. Ferguson has given it. The words are Burns's own in a Clarinda letter, but they are unfortunate, not only because people will think you must mean *Pride and Prejudice*, but—far worse—because as a character of Burns it is not true. No doubt he had a good share both of passion and pride, but he was really a far better, and nicer fellow than that. Much more apt is Maria Riddell in those affectionate words in the Dumfries newspaper, a few days after the poet's death, which Henley and Henderson call "the best thing written of Burns by any contemporary critic,"—"Mr. Burns had an irresistible power of attraction." Here was a genius of the first order, a soaring spirit conscious of its power, an intensely enjoying temper, and a passionate interest in human beings, in the outward

setting of a hard and grim life, doing a man's full work and bearing a man's anxieties from the time he was a boy of sixteen. No doubt there were slips and failings many, no one has judged these more sternly than himself. But his spirit was never broken and never soured, and the "irresistible power of attraction" was there to the end. One likes to think of the last authentic sight of Burns, passing off the scene like Milton's Samson, in "calm of mind, all passion spent."

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A Biographical Study. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1938. Pp. xvi+373. 18s. net.

COLERIDGE has not been very fortunate in his biographers. From Gillman onwards all seem to have lacked one or other, if not both, of the two qualities indispensable to the production of a really satisfactory biography: the habits of patience and rigid accuracy necessary for unravelling the tangled skein of his strange career, and the gift of imaginative sympathy. It need hardly be said that in the first of these the author of *The Elizabethan Stage* and *William Shakespeare* was not likely to fail. Nor has he; every page bristles with chapter-and-verse references confirming almost every statement made. As a means of finding out with the minimum of trouble exactly where Coleridge was on April 18, 1798, or what he was doing (or not doing) in May 1811, the book is almost perfect. Comment (from whatever quarter) on this aspect can hardly go beyond minor details.

On the second point, however—the imaginative sympathy which is the basis of judgment and tact in a biographer—it is impossible not to feel many doubts. To begin with, the book is (a strange complaint, but true) simply not long enough. Dowden's *Shelley* fills a thousand pages, Mr. Harper's *Wordsworth* well over six hundred; and even Mr. Howe's *Hazlitt*, where the materials were far less copious than with Coleridge, is substantially longer than Sir Edmund's volume. Compression, moreover, is here obtained not simply by a general scaling down of external details (except to a limited extent in the "Sage of Highgate" period), but by omitting all but the absolutely indispensable illustrative quotations from letters, diaries, and so on, and by paring down "background" description and explanatory comment almost to

vanishing-point. Readers knowing little of Godwin, Thelwall, and Crabb Robinson, for instance, will not be much enlightened here ; and allusions to the course of the Revolutionary Wars and to politics are of such extreme brevity that even fairly well-informed readers will not find it easy to understand how and why Coleridge's political views changed so greatly that Hazlitt had at least some pretext for accusing him of apostasy. Nor is this complaint inapplicable to matters of more specifically literary interest. The poems of Coleridge's *annus mirabilis* (1797-8) and the *Biographia Literaria* are given, between them, considerably less space than *The Watchman* and *The Friend*, for no better reason than that the latter involved a great deal of correspondence, business negotiation, and travelling.

These criticisms have weight not only in themselves but also as affecting what may be vaguely termed the "tone" of the book as a whole. This, it must be frankly said, is not very happy. If Coleridge, a century after his death, is worth a biography at all, evidently it should be one which preserves our idea of his greatness—though not, of course, at the sacrifice of any jot of the truth about his numerous and dismal failures. But Sir Edmund seems to start disliking his subject on p. 5, at latest ; and he maintains doggedly his role of *advocatus diaboli* to the bitter end, putting Coleridge in the wrong so persistently that we soon begin to take sides in his favour (even sometimes against our better judgment), and chronicling innumerable instances of the devoted self-sacrifice of friends like Cottle, Poole, and Gillman without, apparently, realizing that they are totally inexplicable except on the assumption that, not merely as a young man but throughout his life, Coleridge struck all who knew him as a really great man, who simply *could* not be judged and condemned by the standards of social and personal morality applicable to ordinary people. When Coleridge accepted the Wedgwood annuity in 1798, "perhaps the worst thing possible," says Sir Edmund, "had happened to him" :

I do not suggest [he goes on] that he should have become a Unitarian minister. But it was time for him, in one way or another, to take up his share of the economic burden which is, or ought to be, the common lot of humanity. Instead, here was an endowment which, in terms at least, left it possible for him to go on just as he had always done.

It is fanciful to detect here a faint flavour of that *Gleichgeschaltung* of the arts which has done so much harm in modern times, politically chiefly in certain foreign countries, but economically everywhere

alike? Can we feel quite sure, one is tempted to ask, whether Dante, Spenser, Milton, Gibbon, Shelley, or even Wordsworth would have done all they did had they been (as they were not in any such sense as is implied here) required to "take up their share of the economic burden"?

The truth is that in tracing, as he seems to do, Coleridge's fatal opium habit to his "fundamental instability of character" Sir Edmund is putting the cart before the horse. The evidence (important items are the early illnesses duly chronicled on p. 6) will as readily, and more charitably, carry the interpretation that it was the opium that caused the indecision, leaving its victim more, perhaps, than a little damaged, but still—as Lamb, his most acute as well as his kindest critic at the time, perceived—still most unmistakably "an archangel." It is because he misses this point in laying so much stress on Coleridge's deficiency in the civic and domestic virtues that Sir Edmund's book, despite its merits as an efficient revision of Dykes Campbell's *Narrative*, fails to satisfy.

One or two small points may be mentioned in conclusion. In dealing (pp. 296-7) with the *Edinburgh Review* article (September 1816) believed by Coleridge to be Hazlitt's, Sir Edmund seems to miss the point of Mr. Howe's argument (in the appendix to his *Life of Hazlitt*) that Jeffrey must have mangled Hazlitt's article just as Gifford had mangled Lamb's review of *The Excursion*. As a work of reference the book would be easier to use if the dates at the head of each page were given year by year, instead of merely repeating the years covered by the chapter in hand; thus at p. 261 a slip or misprint, "April 1815" for "1814," throws the reader out in his chronology for several pages. The only other misprints of any consequence that I have noticed are: p. 57, line 16, "phrase" should probably be "praise"; p. 201, line 7 of poem, read "heathy hills"; p. 226, line 2, "let him through," read "let him down." The index is good, but a few illustrations—or at any rate a reproduction of the Peter Vandyke portrait of 1795—would have been welcome.

R. W. KING.

Essays and Studies. By Members of the English Association. Vol. XXIII. Collected by S. C. ROBERTS. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1938. Pp. 92. 7s. 6d. net.

THE present collection contains a somewhat larger proportion of specialized material than is customary in this series. The extent

to which literature is conditioned by the status of the author has been generally underrated by literary historians, and on this account Mr. H. S. Bennett's study of "The Author and His Public in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries" is the more welcome as making good some of the lacunæ in a very defective chapter. His concise survey of patronage, the conditions of the monastic scriptorium, and the distinction between full-time and part-time authorship points to a source of distinctive features in mediæval literature, though he might have made more of "that prince of patrons" Duke Humphrey, whose patronage so far transcended that of other English princes as to inaugurate a new era in English culture. Miss M. S. Serjeantson offers the gourmet an appendage to Mrs. Beeton and M. Boulestin both learned and practical. The title, "The Vocabulary of Cookery in the Fifteenth Century," scarcely does justice to an article containing so liberal a store of choice recipes coupled with appropriate culinary utensils; but while the general reader will turn eagerly to her piquant modern renderings, the philologist also will find much interesting material in her comments upon gastronomic terms both rare and familiar. In an article on "A Colony of Jews in Shakespeare's London," Professor C. J. Sisson describes the condition and status of sixteenth-century Jewish refugees, many of whom were acting as agents for trade with Spain; his article includes an interesting contemporary record of Jewish religious observances secretly practised in a Jewish household. Mr. Leonard Whibley contributes "Notes on Two Manuscripts of Thomas Gray," one consisting of two pages from Gray's "Chronological Tables" now in Harvard College Library, the other containing the earliest version of *A Long Story* and in the possession of Mr. John W. Garrett, of Baltimore; the chief divergencies between the latter and the printed version occur in the notes. An important addition to Boswell studies is provided by Mr. L. F. Powell in a paper on the original Journal of the tour to the Hebrides, discovered at Malahide Castle in 1930 and published by Messrs. Heinemann, with notes by F. A. Pottle and C. H. Bennett, in 1936. The original Journal is substantially longer than the printed version, and more characteristic of its author in its greater frankness and freedom of speech illustrated in such phrases as "a worthy harmless man," applied to Sir Alexander Gordon, or "a gentle mild-looking youth," to Boswell himself, which subsequently became "a quiet benevolent man" and "a civil decent young

man." Equally suggestive are the copious details of meals deleted from the printed version. Mr. G. M. Young, writing on "The Technique of Criticism: Classical," pleads for a closer fidelity to the Dionysian principle of purity of idiom, with a corresponding rejection of "jargon on one side and deliberate phrase-making on the other," a classical standard which, with some modifications, might profitably be accepted by authors and reviewers of to-day. A brief notice cannot do justice to Mr. Frank Swinnerton's excellent paper on "Variations of Form in the Novel," in which it is shown that what appear to be changes in the art of fiction amount, in many cases, to nothing more than changes in technique.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

Essays and Studies. By members of the English Association (United Provinces Branch). Allahabad. 1938. Pp. vi+179. Rs. 2\$.

In this volume are collected papers read before the United Provinces Branch of the English Association since its foundation in 1927. It opens with a Foreword by the President, Professor Jha, stressing the importance of an extensive rather than an intensive study of English in India, which is followed by an Inaugural Address, by Professor S. G. Dunn, explaining the aims and objects of the Society. The problem confronting the teacher of English in India is further pursued by Mr. R. R. Sreshta in a paper on the teaching of English composition in Indian schools and by Mr. S. C. Deb, who urges the need of a scale of values in Indian universities and, as a preliminary step, the study of a classical language with English and one other European language by "a small and honourable minority." English as well as Indian readers will find many points of interest in Sir Edward Blunt's compact survey of the development of English vocabulary. Professor Jha contributes a paper on the poetry of Kipling, concentrating upon Kipling's achievement as "par excellence the soldier's poet" of Anglo-India and upon his treatment of the eternal verities as compared with that of Thomas Hardy. The inclusion of another paper on Kipling, by Mr. K. K. Mehrotra, leads to some repetition, though Mr. Mehrotra, treating of "Kipling and 'The Bubble Reputation,'" approaches the subject from a different aspect. It is curious that neither contributor should have made any reference to Kipling's books for children. "Mediæval

Sidelights on Paradise Lost " is the subject of an interesting paper by Mr. P. E. Dustoor, who cites analogues from patristic and mediæval sources to Milton's treatment of the Creation, the Fall, and the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise. Criticism of modern English poetry is represented by papers on De la Mare and D. H. Lawrence. Mr. B. Shankar finds in De la Mare " a poetic grasp of reality that is unafraid of dreams," a vision that combines " the modernist quality of courage in facing the facts of life with variety of outlook and suggestiveness of expression." Mr. R. N. Deb follows a familiar line of interpretation in attributing the " mixture of opposites " in Lawrence, of fine sensuousness with coarse brutality, to a mother-complex. Mr. B. Simlai, writing on George Crabbe, is so preoccupied with Crabbe's realism as almost to overlook his art as a story-teller. The series concludes with a summary record of the Branch's work from 1927 to 1938. Several of the papers suffer from diffuseness and the introduction of material not strictly relevant; but as a whole the collection bears evidence of real enthusiasm for the study of English in India and of a general desire to grapple with the problems which such a study entails.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

SHORT NOTICES

Seventh Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400 : addition and modifications to July, 1938. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1938.

It is only necessary to welcome the appearance of this new supplement to Professor Wells's well-known and indispensable *Manual*, which of course follows in all respects the arrangement employed in the earlier ones. The seven supplements now offer a complete conspectus of the work done on middle English writings since 1916, and it is impossible not to hope that before very long they may be incorporated into a second edition of the *Manual*, thus obviating the search in eight volumes for a desired item of information.

R. B. McK.

Form und Struktur der Shakespeareschen Komödien : Eine Vorstudie zum Problem des Dramatischen bei Shakespeare. Von Dr. Walter Jacobi, Berlin. Triltsch & Huther. 1937. Pp. 134.

It may be as well to begin with Dr. Jacobi's conclusion, which is, that to those purely formal principles of comedy which Lyly and certain academic dramatists learnt and practised from Plautus and the Italians—that there should be unity of tone and unity of subject, and that monotony should be avoided by means of

episodes or sub-plots and by the intermingling of high and low comedy—Shakespeare added little or nothing, and that his superiority to Lyly lies in the greater depth and truth of the various "worlds" he has created. This conclusion, though unexceptionable, is hardly new; nevertheless, in order to establish it more firmly, Dr. Jacobi attempts a formal analysis of all Shakespeare's comedies, scene by scene. The reader who tries to follow him through these hundred pages of form without matter, these analyses of the conflicts and intrigues between bodiless A, B, C's and X, Y, Z's (for to this Shakespeare's characters are by such a procedure reduced) will probably find himself, as Johnson said of the reader of Dyer's *Fleece*, "sunk beneath a weight of insupportable oppression." Flashes of light will sometimes illuminate the gloom: he will learn, for example, that, while in *Love's Labour's Lost* action and complication are merely incidental and only dialogue essential, in the *Comedy of Errors* complication is essential and wit nothing (pp. 57-8). More often, the sort of thing he will encounter will be this:

"The theme that forms the main action is of bourgeois simplicity: dispute between father and daughter about the latter's future husband. The suspense-question: Who will be victor, daughter or father? The arrangement of the parties is: Lysander plus Hermia against Egeus plus Demetrius" (p. 65). Or this:

"The main action reveals in its lay-out a strong resemblance to the first secondary action in *As You Like It*. Here, too, we are concerned with a man desperately in love with a woman who does not want him and defies all attempts to win her. Or, in purely technical language: There are two parties, between which there exists an opposition, and one of the parties (Orsino) tries to conquer the other (Olivia), not, however, in order to annihilate it, but in order to be fused with it. A third party (Viola) thrusts herself in between, in order to work as mediator, but against her will becomes a means of division, which makes the already existing separation still sharper. Olivia falls in love with her, as Phoebe does with Rosalind, and tries to win the mediator. Her thinking and acting, however, produce a confusion of the threads, for Viola, like Rosalind, is not taken for what she is, so that a disentanglement is required" (pp. 113-14).

J. B. LEISHMAN.

The Ferrar Papers. Edited by B. Blackstone. Cambridge. At the University Press. 1938. Pp. xxii+323. 21s. net.

This volume will be interesting to all lovers of *John Inglesant*. The name of Nicholas Ferrar, as the friend of George Herbert and the founder and head of the remarkable community at Little Gidding, had never been quite forgotten, but it was Shorthouse who made it known again fifty years ago. In Dr. Blackstone's careful and pious study we clasp hands with "Mr Ferrar" and his niece Mary Collet; we are even given a picture of the little church, no bigger than a small College chapel, where at the third collect in evensong Inglesant heard a slight stir, and saw the messenger come to summon him to his perilous mission. A new edition of Ferrar's *Life*, long out of print, is welcome, as well as many of the family letters; not least so, those of Mistress Bathsheba Ferrar, apparently the one member who did not at all fit into the community. One admires the devout order and industry of them all, their beautiful book-binding, and the fine penmanship of Mary Collet and her sisters. But the long "Ascetic Dialogue," with its grim title *The Winding Sheet*, which Ferrar and his nieces not only spoke but "acted," is surely to carry the devotional life too far.

DUNCAN C. MACGREGOR.

Shenstone. An eighteenth-century portrait. By A. R. Humphreys. Cambridge University Press. 1937. Pp. xii+136. 6s.

Mr. Humphreys has given us a delightful study of Shenstone. It is an out-of-doors portrait, Shenstone in his *ferme ornée*, an artist in his landscape garden. It was an uneventful life passed far from London; a few elegant poems rippled its

placidity; charming letters denoted to his friends its continuance. Yet Shenstone became almost a famous man, because he devoted his life to cultivating his garden.

Mr. Humphreys sketches the history of gardening in the century before Shenstone, and the æsthetic ideas which lie behind it, in a chapter on "the quest of the Sharawadgi." Sharawadgi was a supposed Chinese word recognizing the existence of beauty in asymmetry. The Leasowes kept abreast of fashion, and Shenstone's income did not allow of any immoderate expenditure on improving nature. Contemporary opinion seems to prove that "in the Leasowes the century found a satisfactory crystallization of those ideals of human association, elegiac naturalism, well-bred charm and variety, with a touch of the dramatic, which it was forming for itself as it progressed." Lest we smile at Shenstone's "improvements," we should remember that his estate now contains a railway embankment, factory chimneys, and "an enamelled advertisement for steel in large white letters."

Mr. Humphreys writes with an entertaining precision, but in a book largely about gardens it is perhaps unfortunate to refer to the gardener as "one of nature's wallflowers."

A. TILLOTSON.

Thomas Gray, Scholar. The true tragedy of an eighteenth-century gentleman. By W. P. Jones. Harvard University Press. 1937. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, London. Pp. xvi + 191. 15s. net.

Mr. Jones finds the "true tragedy" of Gray in his diversion by West's death from being a poet to becoming a scholar, and as only a little less tragic the fact that as a scholar Gray was unfortunate in not having the "poverty that commanded him to write for a living." The results were a meagre trickle of poetry and no published work of scholarship.

Mr. Jones is mainly concerned with tracing Gray's life of scholarship, with piecing together from Gray's letters, notebooks, commonplace books, marginalia, etc., the course and direction of his studies—from the classics to natural history *via* oriental geography, the origins of English poetry and modern history. Gray's method and mind were excellent: in each of the subjects he studied he became an authority. But his edition of Strabo, his history of English poetry, his other historical works were never written. Mr. Jones shows how important these works would have been, and how advanced were Gray's ideas on the subjects. Gray the scholar helps to explain Gray the poet, and Mr. Jones brings out the influence that his study of Welsh poetry had on his own. There are frequent extracts from Gray's commonplace books, which Mathias did not always print accurately. Two youthful notebooks are printed for the first time: Gray's early catalogue of his library and his notes on learned periodicals. Mr. Jones also provides a 7-page register of Gray's autograph MSS. (excluding poems and letters), most of which have been. Mr. Jones's sources for what is a useful compilation of Gray's activities as a scholar.

A. TILLOTSON.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

All for Love. J. Dryden. Ed. A. SALE, with an Introduction and Notes. London : University Tutorial Press, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xxiv+223.

Altenglisches Elementarbuch. M. LEHNERT. Berlin : W. de Gruyter & Co. 1939. Pp. 118. RM. 1.62.

The American Play-Party Song. B. A. BOTKIN. Lincoln : University of Nebraska. 1937. Pp. xii+13-400. \$1.50.

The Art of Poetry in Iceland (The Taylorian Lecture). Sir WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1937. Pp. 34. 2s. net.

Beowulf : The Monsters and The Critics (Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture). J. R. R. TOLKIEN. London : Oxford University Press. 1936. Pp. 53. 3s. net.

Bibliography and Index of Publications of Western Reserve University for the Years 1822-1936 (Western Reserve University Bulletin. May 1937). W. T. BRAHM. Cleveland, Ohio. Pp. 83.

Bildungs-und Erziehungsideale bei Milton (Eine Kulturpolitische Studie zum 17. Jahrhundert). H. KRETER. Halle : Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1938. Pp. vi+64. RM. 2.40.

Carlyles Weg zu Goethe. H. PLAGENS. Bottrop i. W. : W. Postberg. 1938. Pp. 99.

Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson. C. F. WHEELER. Princeton : Princeton University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1938. Pp. viii+212. \$3.50 ; 16s. net.

The Defense of Galileo. THOMAS CAMPANELLA. Trs. and edited by G. MCCOLLEY. Smith College Studies in History, Vol. XXII, Nos. 3-4. Northampton, Mass. : Smith College. 1937. Pp. xlv+93.

Der Industrie-Dialekt von Birmingham (Intonation und Sprachvariante). H.-O. WILDE. Halle : Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1938. Pp. viii+88. RM. 3.40.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED 375

Die englische Psalmdichtung im Sechzehnten Jahrhundert. T. RIESE. Münster i. W. : H. Buschmann. 1936. Pp. viii+119.

Die Sage von Gawain und dem Grünen Ritter. O. LÖHMANN. Königsberg und Berlin : Ost-Europa-Verlag. 1938. Pp. iv+97. RM. 3.80.

Die Staatsphilosophie des Englischen Idealismus, Ihre Lehre und Wirkung. K. DOCKHORN. Bochum-Langendreer : Verlag H. Pöppinghaus. 1937. Pp. x+227.

Doughty's English (S.P.E. Tract No. LI). W. TAYLOR. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. 46. 3s. 6d. net.

Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen. D. WECTER. (University of Colorado Studies, Series B, Vol. I, No. 1.) Boulder : University of Colorado. 1939. Pp. 113. \$1.00.

English Irony before Chaucer (University of Toronto Quarterly, July 1937). EARLE BIRNEY. Pp. 538-57.

Fair Play und der "Englische Sportgeist." H. INDORF. Hamburg : Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. 1938. Pp. 78. RM. 3.

Fallentis Semita Vitae (Gray's *Elegy written in a country Church-Yard* rendered into Latin Elegiacs). P. R. BRINTON. Oxford : Basil Blackwell. 1938. Pp. 15. 1s.

Five Elizabethan Tragedies (World's Classics Series). Ed. A. K. McILWRAITH. London : Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. xx+400. 2s. net.

Thyestes, by L. ANNAEUS SENECA, tr. J. HEYWOOD.

Gorboduc, by T. NORTON and T. SACKVILLE.

The Spanish Tragedy, by T. KYD.

Arden of Feversham.

A Woman Killed with Kindness, by T. HEYWOOD.

Inkle and Yarico Album. Selected and arranged by L. M. PRICE. Berkeley : University of California Press ; London : H. Milford. 1937. Pp. vi+171. 11s. 6d. net.

John Keats und das romantische Bewusstsein. HILDEGARD SCHUMANN. Hamburg : Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. 1938. Pp. 62. RM. 3.

Northern Words in Modern English (S.P.E. Tract No. L). Sir Wm. A. CRAIGIE. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1937. Pp. ii+327-61. 2s. 6d. net.

376 R. E. S., VOL. 15, 1939 (N^o 59, JULY)

Notes on Some Miltonic Usages. A. ORAS. Tartu: J. G. Krüger, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 135.

The Poet and the Past. (Warton Lecture on English Poetry). EDITH C. BATHO. London: H. Milford. 1937. Pp. 24. 1s. 6d. net.

Presbyterian Pirate. A Portrait of Stevenson. DORIS N. DALGLISH. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1937. Pp. vi+210. 8s. 6d. net.

Queen Elizabeth, The Revels Office and Edmund Tilney (Annual Elizabeth Howland Lecture). F. S. BOAS. London: Oxford University Press. 1938. Pp. 27. 1s. 6d. net.

Spätantikes und Germanisches Kunstgut in der Frühangelsächsischen Kunst. S. PFEILSTÜCKER. Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag. 1936. Pp. 224. RM. 15. Illustrated.

Studies in Metaphysical Poetry. By T. SPENCER and M. VAN DOREN. New York: Columbia University Press. 1939. Pp. viii+88. 7s. 6d. net.

Two essays, and a bibliography of Studies in Metaphysical Poetry, 1912-1938.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By ALICE WALKER

ANGLIA, Band LXIII., Heft 1/2, January 1939—

Bibliographie zur Geschichte des literarischen Geschmacks in England
(W. Ebisch und L. L. Schücking), pp. 1-64.

Lingfield Again (Kemp Malone), pp. 65-6.

On the etymology of the Surrey place-name.

Altenglisches (Willy Krogmann), pp. 67-72.

On *drocen, byriz, haranhize und hize.

The Short Vowels in French Loan Words like *City*, etc. (Norman
E. Eliason), pp. 73-87.

"Kompromissvokal" und Lautwandel (Herbert Penzl), pp. 88-99.

Observations on New English Syntax (Eston Everett Ericson),
pp. 100-2.

On certain conditional uses of *did* and *was*, and the split infinitive.

Notes on *Beowulf* (Kemp Malone), pp. 103-12.

1. The use of *-ric* in other than personal names (*hereric*, l. 1176; *headoric*,
l. 2466). 2. *Hemming*, l. 1944, and *Heming*, l. 1961. 3. The Ingeld
episode (place and time; *Deoden*, l. 2032; *Hē*, l. 2034; *Fæmnan*, l. 2034;
Duguda biwenede, l. 2035; *Losab*, l. 2062).

Further Notes on the Date of *The Owl and the Nightingale* (Kathryn
Huganir), pp. 113-34.

Popes *Brutus* (Friedrich Brie), pp. 144-85.

The Ancient Mariner (N. Bøgholm), pp. 186-96.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 23, No. 1, April 1939—

Browning as Dramatist (H. B. Charlton), pp. 33-67.

Richard Rolle and the Sorbonne (E. J. F. Arnould), pp. 68-101.

Examination of MSS. from the old Sorbonne library showing that belief
in Rolle's sojourn at the Sorbonne is totally unwarranted.

A Note on the Earliest Printed Texts of Malory's *Morte Darthur*
(Eugène Vinaver), pp. 102-6.

ELH, Vol. VI., No. 1, March 1939—

The Romantic Movement: A Selective and Critical Bibliography for
the Year 1938 (ed. Walter Graham), pp. 1-38.

Recent Elizabethan Criticism (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 39-57.

On Miss Ellis-Fermor's *Jacobean Drama*, 1936, and Miss Bradbrook's
Elizabethan Tragedy, 1935.

Richard Hurd's *Letters on Chivalry and Romance* (Audley L. Smith),
pp. 58-81.

Note (R. W. Frantz), p. 82.

Points out that Prof. Baughan's suggested source for the Houyhnhnms in Sidney's *Apoëgie* (*ELH*, Sept. 1938, vol. v, pp. 207-10) was anticipated by Prof. Nichol Smith in *Essays by Divers Hands, Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, 1935, vol. xiv, p. 43.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XXI., No. 1, February 1939—

Platonism and Sir Joshua Reynolds (Hoyt Trowbridge), pp. 1-7.

That "the true philosophical affinity of Reynolds' classicism is not Plato but John Locke."

Fifteen Years of Shelley Scholarship: A Bibliography, 1923-1938 (William White), pp. 8-11.

— No. 2, April 1939—

The Place of the Attributive Noun-Genitive in Anglo-Saxon with special reference to Gregory's *Dialogues* (B. J. Timmer), pp. 49-72.

A Note on *Macbeth* (Per Thorson), pp. 73-5.

On i. ii. 59-62.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES, Vol. III, No. 1, January-March 1939—

Auguste Angellier et le Génie Poétique de Robert Burns (Floris Delattre), pp. 1-19.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 174,

Heft 3/4, December 1938—

Kultur und politische Rede in England (H. Dietz), pp. 163-79.

Neuenglisch *crack, knock und lap* (Herbert Koziol), pp. 204-5.

— Band 175, Heft 1/2, March 1939—

Über den Goldenen Schnitt als Formprinzip in der frühmittelalterlichen Dichtung der Germanen (Heinz Koch), pp. 1-15.

On the *Abecedarium Nordmannicum* and the twelve-lined Latin poem appended to Ælfric's Life of St. Martin.

Germani und Ingvaeones (Willy Krogmann), pp. 16-23.

Der Name *Germanen* (Willy Krogmann), pp. 24-39.

The Middle English *St. Brendan's Confession* (R. H. Bowers), pp. 40-9.

Die geistige Haltung Richard Rolles (Alex Niederstenbruch), pp. 50-64.

Zur Herkunft von ahd. *thuris*, ags. *þyrs*, aisl. *purs* (Hermann Harder), p. 90.

Ae. *genæstan* "streiten": ae. *hæst* "Heftigkeit, Streit" (F. Mezger), pp. 97-8.

Grammatische und phraseologische Tautologie im. ae. *Beda* (G. Linke), pp. 98-101.

HISTORY, Vol. XXIII., No. 92, March 1939—

Gibbon and *The Decline and Fall* (J. J. Saunders), pp. 346-55.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 379

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY, Vol. II., No. 2, January 1939—

The English Jestbooks of the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries (F. P. Wilson), pp. 121-58.

With Bibliographical Notes supplementary to Schulz's 1912 bibliography (*Palaestra*, CXVII).

Humanitarianism and Romanticism (Edward Allen Whitney), pp. 159-78.

The Treatment of Constitutional History in Macaulay's *History of England* (Godfrey Davies), pp. 179-204.

A Scribe and Printer in the Fifteenth Century (R. B. Haselden), pp. 205-11.

An account of the Huntington Library copy of Gerson's *Opuscula diversa*, Brussels, 1475, and the MS. addition of another tract, Gerson's "De statu curatorum et privilegiorum."

An Oxford Epigram-Book of 1589 (Hoyt H. Hudson), pp. 213-7.

On the pamphlet *De Caede et Interitu . . . Henrici Tertii . . . Epigrammata*, Oxford, 1589, with sidelight on Greville and the 1590 *Arcadia*.

James Shirley and a Group of Unnoted Poems on the Wedding of Thomas Stanley (Gerald Eades Bentley), pp. 219-31.

On *epithalamia* by Shirley, Edward Sherburn, William Fairfax, and William Hammond in the Huntington Library copy of *Poems and Translations*. By *Thomas Stanley Esquire*, 1647, with a Bibliographical Note on the copy (pp. 231-2) by Lyle H. Wright.

Coleridge's Marginalia in Mather's *Magnalia* (David Davies), pp. 233-40.

LES LANGUES MODERNES, XXXVII^e Année, No. 1, January-February 1939—

La Coordination des Enseignements et la Nomenclature Grammaticale (Charles Mollon), pp. 56-62.

LEUVENSCHÉ BIJDRAGEN, Jaargang XXX., Afl. 1-2, 1938—

Remarques sur le mot *Sandhi* (A. Carnoy), pp. 73-9.

LIBRARY, Vol. XIX., No. 4, March 1939—

Notes on Early Music Printing (Bruce Pattison), pp. 389-421.

Archdeacon Francis Wrangham: a Supplement (Michael Sadleir), pp. 422-61.

The Caxton Indulgence of 1476 (K. Povey), pp. 462-4.

Text of the Belfast MSS.

The First Printing of the Letters of Pope and Swift (Maynard Mack), pp. 465-85.

Lyrical Ballads, 1800: A Paste-in (John Edwin Wells), pp. 486-91.

Correspondence: Sir Thomas Browne's Autograph Corrections (John Carter), pp. 492-3.

Cf. *Library*, December 1938, pp. 347-53.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. VIII., No. 1, February 1939—

On *Hrafnkels Saga Freysgoða* (E. V. Gordon), pp. 1-32.

The Hague Manuscript of the *Epistola Cuthberti de Obitu Bedæ* with Bede's Song (N. R. Ker), pp. 40-4.

The English prose *Benedictus*: a second manuscript (Eric Colledge), pp. 45-9.

An account of the Thomlinson MS. now in the Newcastle Public Library and formerly in St. Nicholas' Cathedral, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIV., No. 1, January 1939—

An Unpublished Ballad-Translation by Scott, *The Battle of Killiecrankie* (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 13-18.

Text printed from the holograph MS. in the Morgan Library. See *M.L.N.*, Mar. 1939, p. 235 for a communication from James C. Corson, pointing out that the ballad-translation was printed in *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, 1, 380-1 (December 29, 1832).

The Ruin (Stephen J. Herben), pp. 37-9.

A suggestion that the Exeter Book poem was inspired by Hadrian's Wall and the associated complex of Roman settlements.

— No. 2, February 1939—

Jaques, and the Antiquaries (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 79-85.

An answer to some recent critics.

Romeo and Juliet Further Restored (N. B. Allen), pp. 85-92.

On the necessity for clearing the text of unnecessary "emendations" from *Q1*.

What Purgative Drug? (A. R. Dunlap), pp. 92-4.

Suggested emendation of "Cyme" (*Macbeth*, v. iii. 55) to "Tyme" (thyme).

Pettie and Greene (C. J. Vincent), pp. 105-11.

Parallel passages. See also a Postscript, *M.L.N.*, May 1939, p. 398.

Melbancke and Gosson (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 111-4.

Parallel Passages.

Swift, Motte and the Copyright Struggle: Two Unnoticed Documents (Donald Cornu), pp. 114-24.

Documents among the Bathurst Papers.

Horace Walpole and Edmund Burke (Dixon Wecter), pp. 124-6.

Text, with commentary, of an unpublished letter of Walpole to Burke (December 3, 1777) now in the Fitzwilliam archives, Wentworth Woodhouse (Yorks).

Some Sources of Wordsworth's Passages on Mythology (Elizabeth K. Holmes), pp. 127-9.

Purchas his Pilgrimage and the *Excursion*, Bk. IV.

Poe's Dr. Percival. A Note on *The Fall of the House of Usher* (Harry R. Warfel), pp. 129-31.

Evidence that the reference is to Dr. Thomas Percival (1740-1804) of Manchester, physician and author.

See Myche, Say Lytell, and Lerne to Soffer in Tyme (Carleton Brown), pp. 131-3.

Attribution of this poem, ascribed by Stow to Lydgate, to "R. Stokys" in a fifteenth-century MS. (Corp. Chr. Coll. Oxf. MS. 203); with biographical data concerning persons to any one of whom the latter MS. may refer.

Wife of Bath's Tale 1159-62 (John S. Kenyon), pp. 133-7.

A Further Note on Dorigen's *Exempla* (Germaine Dempster), pp. 137-8.

On the series of glosses in the *Franklin's Tale*, El, opposite F 1455-64.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIV., No. 3, March 1939—

Vinland and Ultima Thule (John Th. Honti), pp. 159-72.

Dryden's Use of Scudéry's *Almahide* (Jerome W. Schweitzer), pp. 190-2.

New Facts Regarding Owen Feltham (Fred S. Tupper), pp. 199-201.

Light shed mainly by wills and chancery suits on Feltham's character, connection with the O'Briens, and death (February 23, 1667/8).

Chapman's Fortune with Winged Hands: Supplementary (Allan H. Gilbert), p. 201.

A supplementary example to those cited in *M.L.N.*, March 1937, pp. 190-2.

— No. 4, April 1939—

Robert Henryson and the Fulgentian Horse (Marshall W. Stearns), pp. 239-45.

MS. Sloane 3548, Folio 158 (Ramona Bressie), pp. 246-56.

Text and discussion of the provenance of this leaf containing a mediæval catalogue of books.

Numerical Symbolism in Dante and the *Pearl* (Coolidge Otis Chapman), pp. 256-9.

Exeter Book Riddle 41 as a Continuation of Riddle 40 (Marcus Konick), pp. 259-62.

Jaques' "Seven Ages" and Bartholomæus Anglicus (John W. Draper), pp. 273-6.

A Textual Dilemma in *1 Henry IV* (Matthias A. Shaaber), pp. 276-8.

On v. i. 1-3 ("busky" or "bulky"?).

Some Plays by George Soane (W. P. Bowman), pp. 278-9.

Identification as by Soane of five plays classified as of unknown authorship in Prof. Allardyce Nicoll's *History of Early Nineteenth Century Drama*.

William Painter and Thomas Heywood (Douglas Bush), pp. 279-80.

On erroneous lists of sources for the *Palace of Pleasure* and the erroneous ascription to Heywood of *The Life and Death of Hector*, 1614, modernized from Lydgate.

An Interpretation of Donne's Tenth Elegy (Fredson T. Bowers), pp. 280-2.

A Note on Line 1514 of the *Heliand* (Edward H. Sehrt), pp. 284-5.

Housman's *Last Poems*, XXX, and Heine's *Lyrisches Intermezzo*, 62 (Herman Salinger), pp. 288-90.

Phenagling (R. H. Griffith), pp. 291-2.

An etymological suggestion.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LIV., No. 5, May 1939—

Byron's Translation and Use of Modern Greek Writings (Panos Morphopoulos), pp. 317-26.

Notes on 41 Skinner Street (Ford K. Brown), pp. 326-32.
On Godwin's tenancy from 1807.

Shakespeare Forbears (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 332-9.
Fallacies of Shakespearean criticism.

The Date and Authorship of *The Fraternitje of Vacabondes* (Allan G. Chester), pp. 347-51.

Note on Dekker's *Old Fortunatus* (W. L. Halstead), pp. 351-2.

Milton as Proof Reader (Donald G. Stillman), pp. 353-4.

Notes on Ambrose Philips (S. F. Fogle), pp. 354-9.

The Beginning of Pope's Friendship with Spence (Austin Wright), pp. 359-61.

A Doubtful Poem in the Collins Canon (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 361-2.
Evidence for Collins's authorship of "Song. The Sentiments Borrow'd from Shakespear."

Defoe's Use of Personal Experience in *Colonel Jack* (John Robert Moore), pp. 362-3.

A Note on *Kettner's Book of the Table* (Francis X. Roellinger), pp. 363-4.
Evidence of Dallas's authorship in a letter to F. J. Furnivall.

Correspondence: Corrections to the Shields Bibliography of Italian Translations (Mary Kessi), pp. 397-8.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXIV., No. 1, January 1939—

Echoes of Childermas in the Tale of the Prioress (Marie Padgett Hamilton), pp. 1-8.

Wit in a Constable: Censorship and Revision (J. H. Walter), pp. 9-20.

"Fleshly Love" in Chaucer's *Troilus* (Willis Wager), pp. 62-6.

A Suppressed Hendiadys in a Poem of Surrey (S. Gorley Putt), pp. 66-7.

A suggestion that Tottel's comma in the second line of the first stanza of the obituary poem on Wyatt is incorrect.

A *Hamlet* Emendation (James G. McManaway and William B. Van Lennep), pp. 68-70.

On III. ii, 396-7, supporting the emendation of "weasel" to "ousel."

— No. 2, April 1939—

Peele's *Old Wive's Tale* (Harold Jenkins), pp. 177-85.

Michael Drayton as a "Historian" in the *Legend of Cromwell* (Kathleen Tillotson), pp. 186-200.

Dryden and the "Waverley Novels" (R. K. Gordon), pp. 201-6.

Richardson: Idealist or Realist? (William White), pp. 240-1.

The Edinburgh *Ramblers* (C. B. Bradford), pp. 241-4.

The Dating of Shelley's notes and translations from Plato (James A. Notopoulos), pp. 245-8.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang XXIV., Afl. 2, 1939—

Over Shelley en Hölderlin (L. Verkoren), pp. 121-6.

Der archaische Charakter des Westgermanischen (Matteo Bartoli), pp. 127-140.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 176, March 4, 1939—

John Lyly and Queen Elizabeth (Warren B. Austin), pp. 146-7.

A letter (B.M. MS. Add. 12507, fol. 140) from Toby Matthew to Sir Julius Caesar, February 9, 1604, pleading for relief of Lyly.

The "Taint-Worm" in "Lycidas" (W. W. S.), p. 153.

Corrigendum to correspondent's communication, *N. & Q.*, February 18, pp. 112-3.

Coleridge and Shelley (T. C. C.), p. 159.

A common source for "Alastor" and "France: An Ode" in Aeschylus, *Prometheus*, ll. 88-90; cf. *N. & Q.*, February 11, pp. 98-9.

— March 11—

John Wilson as Professor (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 164-6.

Whitman on Byron, Scott and Sentiment (Joseph Jay Rubin), p. 171.

Milton's Golden Compasses (Joseph E. Morris), pp. 176-7.

Cf. *N. & Q.*, vol. 172, p. 294, and February 11, pp. 97-8.

— March 25—

A Miltonian Puzzle (E. H. Visiak), pp. 200-1.

A suggestion that Milton and Marvell collaborated in the epigram to Queen Christina of Sweden ("Bellipotens virgo . . .").

— April 1—

John Wilson and the Chair of Modern Philosophy at Edinburgh (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 219-22.

— April 8—

Footnote for a Political Letter of Shelley (William H. Davenport), pp. 236-7.

Notes on the proposed recipients of Shelley's *Proposal for Putting Reform to the Vote* (Letter to Ollier, c. March 1817).

Hugh Henry Brackenridge and Milton's "Piedmontese" Sonnet (Thomas P. Haviland), pp. 243-4.

Milton's influence on early American verse.

— April 15—

Drayton and *Edward III* (H. W. Crundell), pp. 258-60.

Reply by Mrs. Tillotson, May 6, pp. 318-9; by Mr. Crundell, May 20, pp. 356-7.

— April 22—

The Heart of Midlothian: Slips in Quotation (Philoscotus), p. 277.

Correction of a slip in Sir Herbert Grierson's *Sir Walter Scott, Bart.*, 1938.

The Papers of Samuel Rogers (M. Eleanor Prentiss), p. 279.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of papers formerly in the possession of the Sharpe family.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 18, 1939—

Matthew Arnold's Elm (William Bliss), p. 163.

Further correspondence by A. F. Pollard, March 25, p. 175; by William Bliss, April 1, pp. 189-90; by A. W. Lidderdale, April 8, p. 203; by A. F. Pollard, April 15, pp. 217-8 and William Bliss, p. 218; by E. B. Poulton, April 22, pp. 233-4.

Scots History and Sentiment (T. E. Lloyd), p. 163.

On Scott and clan tartans. Further correspondence by R. Erskine of Marr, March 25, p. 175; by Lt.-Col. M. M. Haldane, April 8, p. 204; by T. E. Lloyd, April 22, p. 234.

Johnson's Letters (D'Arcy W. Thompson), p. 163.

A suggested emendation ("encomium") for the letter to Charles O'Connor (Hill Powell, i. 321); cf. R. W. Chapman's Notes, March 4, p. 140.

— March 25, 1939—

Who was Fiona McLeod? (Ernest A. Baker), p. 175.

Further correspondence by Geoffrey Taylor, April 1, p. 190; by Dallas Kenmare, April 8, pp. 203-4 and E. Ashton Jonson, p. 204; article, April 22, p. 233; letter from R. Farquharson Sharp, April 29, p. 250. Correspondence closed.

— April 8, 1939—

Romantic (Arthur N. Stunz), p. 204.

Use of the adjective, earlier than the first example cited in the *O.E.D.*, in Thomas Bayly's *Herba Parietis*, 1650.

William Dunbar (J. W. Baxter), p. 208.

On copies of three poems ("Without Glaidnes Availis No Tressour," "Rycht airlie on Ask Weddinsday," and "Gladethe thoue Queyne of Scottis Regioun") in the Register of Sansines, Aberdeen.

— April 15, 1939—

Mirror for Magistrates (A. L. Rowse), p. 217.

Evidence in corroboration of Miss L. B. Campbell's suggested identification of "Master Cavyl" with the Cornish M.P., Humphrey Cavell (d. 1557).

The Dumb Show (E. M. W. Tillyard), p. 217.

Suggests connection between Claudius's reception of the dumb-show and Montaigne's essay "Of Sadness."

The Metaphysical Society (Alan W. Brown), p. 218.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of certain papers.

— April 22, 1939—

Shelley and the Don Juan (Frederick L. Jones), p. 233.

Supplementary evidence to the correspondent's letter, *T.L.S.*, January 18, 1936, on the name of Shelley's boat.

— April 29, 1939—

The Birthplace of Matthew Prior (H. Bunker Wright), p. 250.

Difficulties in the way of identifying Prior with the Matthew Prior baptized at St. Margaret's, Westminster, August 2, 1664.

Gibbon's Library (Rupert Hart-Davis), p. 250.

Enquiry concerning the whereabouts of books from Gibbon's library.

The Vernal Wood (T. E. Casson), p. 250.

Wordsworth and St. Bernard.

William
A. F.
ulton,

Marr,
T. E.

onnor

Dallas
April
Cor-

D., in

our,"
ne of

ation
7).

and

y 18,

rized